

the amendments. That is the section that we are discussing. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. I have got three messages to use in this speech. First, I want to say that today's direction is demonstrably different and I think better because it is aimed at trying to bridge differences between this, rather than to finding who is going to be the victor. So I like that, and I want to applaud Senator Ashford for starting that discussion. Second, I want to tell you some things I could agree to, things I could do to try to bridge the gap that has arisen between us, and, third, I want to give you the results as to what I think about this amendment. Let me tell you some things that I think I could agree to. I could agree to what I heard as a principle that Howard Lamb enunciated yesterday as a way of dealing with this problem, and that is to find a system which is nearly neutral to the agricultural sector in its impact with respect to the personal property tax crisis. Given the context of Nebraska's economy and the rural economy, I think that's probably not an unreasonable goal. I have asked what the impact of LB 1063 is on agricultural depreciated equipment. I am told, although we should verify this, that it is about \$14 million. That is the best guess I have gotten through the administration. In fact, I would like to see the best figures that we can run by Denny Donovan, but let's, for the moment, assume that it's \$14 million because that is what I am doing. I am assuming it is 14 million bucks. I am willing to find some offsetting response to the agricultural sector of roughly that amount, and it can come from a variety of places. I see that Senator Ashford has the half of the collection fee. I would consider that. I would consider reducing state aid to pay for that \$14 million. I would consider some form of (inaudible) taxes on business and agribusiness, although I am not interested in seeing that it fall over to the normal taxpayer because I think John Lindsay is right. If we increase their burden, we risk the chance of not having them agree to this principle and agree to the constitutional change that is necessary. In other words, if we can find an accommodation of roughly \$14 million, there are a number of revenue systems that I would be happy to use to pay for that or to make up for it and build into LB 1063 or 1120 that kind of an accommodation. Now let me go to the amendment that we have before us. The amendment that we have before us is \$40 million. It is to the farm sector and the business sector and it trips a whole lot of bad ripple effects in other areas.