

percent of market value. Now, if you really want to play nasty you could reduce residential property to 80 percent and get them on the same status quo. I'm just a little surprised because I can't imagine there'd be a taxpayer in the state of Nebraska happy if their house was taxed at more than 100 percent of market value. Yes, we do pass special tax privileges for other segments of this state. Just ask ConAgra. Just ask those who are benefitted from LB 775. And it's hard for me as a farmer in my rural district to go home and justify voting for those packages, but I'm one of the few farmers on this floor that have voted for them because I think it's good business, because I think we need to keep people in the state of Nebraska. But I will tell you that if agriculture is going to benefit from this tax package we need some guarantees that our property will not be taxed at over 80 percent of market value and we don't have that now. And the Legislature can come back next year and mess with those valuations and mess with how they're being taxed. I think every farmer in the state would feel some comfort in knowing that their ag land will not be valued or taxed at more than 80 percent of market value and I think the residential property owners of the state would feel the same way, as would the commercial. I'm real surprised. I think this is good, sound legislation and I would ask for your continued support and I would hope you would vote against the reconsideration.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Coordsen, members of the Legislature, I would like to speak in favor of the motion for reconsideration. Let me tell you what I thought this was all about and who I thought was the greatest...were the greatest benefactors of all of this tax package that we're dealing with and why I would suggest that maybe to get back on an even keel and to get the full benefit of what we're trying to do here out of this that we ought to take this amendment off. (LR) 292, as I think we all envisioned it, was something to help us facilitate government efficiency. It was, in its first part, for example, having to do with mergers of counties and parts of counties. In its second part it related to differences in classifications that we wanted to deal with because we were interested in merger and consolidation and government efficiency. This was all part of the government efficiency part of our tax package. The overall tax package, the largest beneficiaries of that are the farmer. The largest beneficiaries