

looking at the language right now, relating it back to LB 404 and the sections that were struck. If there was a mistake in drafting as it dealt with the issue as it relates to one year as opposed to a permanent solution, that clearly was not my intent, and had Senator Landis brought it to my attention after we let his amendment go ahead, I would clearly have tried to rectify that prior to debating this, but I don't think there is. Clearly there was no intent to do that. I don't have the time nor the inclination to deceive the body on this issue. It hasn't been my approach to date as we've dealt with it all year. With that, I would urge adoption of the amendment. If there is a need for a technical change, I would be more than happy to address that but, clearly, the issue is one of 80 percent of market, 80 percent of market from here on, not just for tax year 1992.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Next speaker is Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find that illuminating and very helpful. I think we should put aside the question then as to whether this is for one year or for not. Senator Hall has indicated what his intent is. It would be easy to find a little bit of language to offer after we find the fate of this amendment to draw it into the form that Senator Hall intended and to clarify what I...the difficulty I have in reading the language. In other words, that is a solvable problem. Senator Hall and I agree on that and we can put that issue aside. If the amendment is successful, I think we can just draft a little piece of language in addition to this and make sure that we both understand exactly what the amendment says. So let's get to the underlying issue that Senator Hall raises, which is 80 percent of market, and striking the language that deals with developing income figures because that is what the other part of this amendment does. Senator Will has indicated that the department can develop this information if they wish to, and in the past has, and that is quite right. What one of the virtues of 320 is, is that it doesn't say you can develop it, it says you will develop it, and that is a significant difference. It says it is not a matter of discretion for you to go out and do this, it is a matter of statutory obligation to go out and develop income stream figures to use as a way of analyzing through the income stream and the capitalization rate, and then the factor the value of agricultural land. Why would you want to develop income figures