

amendment. That is a much smaller proportion than under 84, 84. Ag, under...no, actually the same homeowners would...they're dollars. Okay. Under the...under my amendment \$43 million of the homestead would go to homeowners, under 84 \$43 million would go to homeowners. Under this bill, though, ag would get back 2 percent relief, under 84 they get back \$32 million. Commercial, industrial property, those who are now getting help from 775, for example, would get \$14.1 million, under this bill they'd get back 9, but that 9 percent would represent only those small businesses that are paying property taxes, who get no relief from 775. And under rental, residential and all the other property there is \$4 million, and they'd continue to get that \$4 million. So, in fact, the big loser is ag and big business, there's no doubt about it.

SENATOR DIERKS: Now what did you say the figures were for ag?

SENATOR LYNCH: Ag, under 84, gets back \$32 million, 32.3, even year. So 64, 65 million dollars over a two year period.

SENATOR DIERKS: Compared to what in your..

SENATOR LYNCH: Under my bill it would be \$4 million for the two year period.

SENATOR DIERKS: Okay, then where does the relief come into the people that you're trying to serve with your amendment?

SENATOR LYNCH: Well, first of all, they'd get the same relief, but it would cut the costs down from \$190 million to \$116 million. I assume if you're trying to find a revenue source, for example, to help pay for this it would certainly help everybody in that regard.

SENATOR DIERKS: I see. Okay, thank you. I understand where Senator Lynch is coming from. I guess I'm going to be in opposition to his amendment. I think that the purpose for the legislation in the first place was to provide somewhat lasting property tax relief be...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR DIERKS: ...be that for corporations, or be that for ranchers and farmers. Of course in my legislative district the big problem has been property tax relief for years. I think