

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Madam President and members, you know 72 years ago the people of the State of Nebraska adopted a Constitution at that time that contained the uniformity clause. I am not that well read on Nebraska constitutional law, but I can only assume there was a good reason they adopted that uniformity clause and the reason was to protect Nebraskans from someone getting preferential treatment by the Legislature. As we've debated this and as the public has debated this and as the press has spewed this out across the front pages as they should, there's been a great deal of discussion about what we're going to do to the Constitution. There's been very little discussion about the uniformity clause, why it's there and why we should change it. Now last year in June and July in this session, at that point in time I was willing to change that. I thought it was at that point in time we were trying to basically get back to the status quo and do something in state tax policy there. Since that time we have changed that dramatically and what 1063 does and the corresponding constitutional amendment that comes up next is that it has...it will ask people of the State of Nebraska to take out the uniformity clause, take out their protection of some special interest or someone getting preferential treatment in the Legislature, to take that out, totally out. Whether that has been adhered to directly or not, is a question obviously. But you're going to take the uniformity clause out and what does 1063 do? 1063, it's been said many times on this floor, will try and treat everybody fairly. What it's going to do, it's going to treat all depreciable property the same because we all know there is one exception to that. There is one basic exception of treating everybody the same. It's the 775 amendment. I like 775. I voted for 775. I have gotten yelled at so many times in my district for voting for that and I'll stand there and defend it and I still will. It's nothing against that bill personally, if you can have a personal objection to a bill. The problem is you want to change the uniformity clause of the Constitution to allow us to treat everybody the same but one. The one entity that can afford \$20 million, the one entity that can create these jobs, very worthwhile, but that's just like the railroad was 100 years ago. People were concerned about that. People don't like it to happen. With the combination of 1063 and the constitutional amendment we're asking people to turn their backs on that while at the same time with 1063 we do exactly what the