

heavy burden for those people who do buy their replacement cattle, or hogs, or whatever. Now a person like me that raises his own replacement heifers would get by scot-free without a property tax on the breeding herd because I don't buy them, I raise them, so all of the funds that it takes to raise that livestock is taken off my tax return immediately. There is nothing to depreciate and it is not eligible for depreciation, nor should it be. However, my neighbor who is in the same business of raising cattle, has cows, but his program is a little bit different. He buys his cows, and then, instead of raising them, so he has a depreciable product. And so that means that he is going to be at a distinct disadvantage to the person that raises his own. It is going to affect the cattle industry in this state, and I don't think we want to do that. I don't think we want to do that, and so I guess I would just urge the body to adopt the amendment so that livestock, all livestock, are treated as inventory, because when we don't do that, we get into real problems between producers who have a slightly different operation, and it would be a real detriment to those people that buy cows and, in fact, you are going to see the price of cows drop considerably just because they know that if they are purchased, then they are going to have to pay tax on them. So it is going to affect the industry in a negative manner. I don't think we want to do that. I hope that this amendment is adopted.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Lamb. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker and members, I guess I almost rise in a neutral capacity on the amendment to raise a concern. Now there has been several...many times in the last week people have referred to LB 1063 as treating personal property uniformly, although I have always escaped me what that meant, and Senator Beutler the other day said that how all the personal property would be treated the same; Senator Warner stated again this morning that all depreciable property will be the same. And as we know 1063 in its present form, that is not a true statement about the way it is, and this amendment, once again, would take out livestock, and treat them differently, that depreciable property that is livestock, and treat them differently than everything else. So, once again, the uniformity clause goes out the window. We are already doing that anyway. We aren't keeping uniformity within class, not even attempt to keep uniformity within...well, like I said, uniformity in the class is even gone, even the sub...the small