

November 15, 1989 LB 7

you come up so we could talk a minute about this so that...you're a little far apart, physically, that is. We're going to be discussing Section 3 of the committee amendments; Section 3 of the committee amendments.

PRESIDENT: Senator Hall, do you have any additional comments you wish to make on Section 3 of the committee amendments?

SENATOR HALL: Mr. President, not at this time. I will...Senator Warner has an amendment to that section and I will address that.

PRESIDENT: All right, thank you. Senator Warner, now on Section 3 of the committee amendments.

SENATOR WARNER: All right. Mr. President and members of the Legislature, the amendment that was handed out this morning, which is AMO39S, I believe...is that right, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: I'm sorry.

SENATOR WARNER: Is the amendment that you are...is it AMO39S?

CLERK: Yes, sir.

SENATOR WARNER: Okay. So the amendment we are first taking up will be all of page 1, 2, 3, 4 and page 5 through line 14. Most of that material that is being put back into the bill is the same as what was in the bill as introduced. The bill, as introduced, did not have a formula to put into the statute on the unit definition that was offered by the railroads. Historically, the process has been authorized by statute for the Tax Commissioner of the Department of Revenue to make these calculations. At the hearing, the railroads came in and requested an amendment to spell out specifically how the formula would be applied. Their argument, as I recall, was that that reflected the agreement with the state on the case that was under litigation and this was to lock it in. I do not believe that it's necessary to have it at all. I think it probably is prudent not to have it. It was indicated to me yesterday by the railroads that they did not particularly care to have it in there either now, and I can't tell you why because I don't know why. I'm sure it was just a coincidence that I had that word shortly after the Lincoln Journal evening paper came out, but it may not have been, I don't know. But the point is that there is