

June 5, 1991

LB 829
LR 186

it's not new. The state has been making efforts to do that since the 1800s repeatedly and the problem rests of the virtual impossibility of determining any kind of equitable valuation of tangible personal property and that's just simply a fact. In fact, even the years when it was uniform, it never was, it never was. Business equipment, as I understand it in most cases was used depreciation schedules in the first place as opposed to where there was a fixed value such as on motor vehicles which is fixed, in effect, by the state and there certainly is an inequity there. I believe that good tax policy demands that the public does have extra protection when the Legislature has additional flexibility. I'm concerned that there are 30 votes to whoever gets the tax shifted to them, that they are not hurt. Conceivably, we passed the sales-income tax one day, I guess it wasn't on 829, it wasn't with 25 votes, but there was a sizeable block. Thirty votes would prevent that from happening, or could. Without this amendment as part of the Constitution, you're back to 25 or quite possibly 30 if you have a Governor's veto. This is double protection. Thirty votes to pass increased appropriations, increases in revenue of any kind, or 30 votes a second time, if the Governor wishes to oppose, and then you indeed have double protection for the citizens which will not be at the same level as has been true in the past. Actually it's not new in the past. We thought we had amended the Constitution a half a dozen times, some of them for special purposes. Eventually some of those were thrown out of the courts if you go way back. In 1970 we thought we had done it. The commitment that was made in 1970 as well as in 1967 on intangibles and as well as tangible personal property, we were going to replace the revenue that local governments lost. We didn't do it. We didn't to it with intangibles, we have not done it with tangible personal property and the result is we shifted it to real property. I think this provides more protection than any other thing we could go if we're going to take that uniformity clause out and I'd urge you to adopt the amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Wesely, did you wish to address the Warner amendment?

SENATOR WESELY: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I understand Senator Warner's argument about the desire to be consistent, but it just appears to me that we adopted Senator Warner's amendment which I supported to have a ten-year lapse on the personal property exemptions, the 30 vote was to apply to personal