

SENATOR WITHEM: Mr. President and members of the body, rise in opposition to suspending the rules. One of the things Senator Johnson asks us to do is spend some time during debate on suspension of the rules to discuss the Warner amendment and explain...I forget if he said why it's a good amendment, why it's a good solution, or whether he said simply why it is better than the amendment that he is proposing. I can do the latter. I probably can't do the former. I can't, in good conscience, stand here in front of you and say that the proposed Warner amendment, of which I am a cosigner, is good policy. For my definition of good policy, good policy is a lot ways further to the left on the spectrum than where we've moved today. It is better than the Rod Johnson amendment for one reason and one reason only. It is the last best hope of finding a solution to the problem on the floor of this Legislature. I do not overstate that. It is the last best hope of finding a solution and that is the only reason that it is good policy. Passed out some numbers that I had the Department of Revenue run and some of them are slightly different than some that we've been throwing around here, but this is the last best effort by the Department of Revenue to come up with fiscal impact. I would like you to take a look at these. First of all, you start with pre-LB 829, 1991 tax base as your base year, and then you manipulate that to show what would happen under different scenarios. The first, all property on tax rolls, and by all property, I am assuming they don't really literally mean all property, that they mean MAPCO, in effect, and understand the basis of the MAPCO decision. The basis of the MAPCO decision was that the pre-LB 829 tax scenario was not fair. It was an unfair system and underlying that was that previous Legislatures have given a break to a segment of our economy, a valuable segment of our economy, an important segment of our economy, a group of good people trying to make a living, but the court had ruled the tax break we had given them was unfair. And if we want to let MAPCO stand, agriculture, according to these statistics, 1991 tax base, would have paid \$39 million more in taxes. And it's under their definition that that is what would be a fair system. That's what happens if the Legislature goes home. We can live with 1063 originally as introduced, using that base of 1991, agriculture will only pay \$10 million more. With the adjustment, because of the criticism that ag people had had of the...of the...I think led by Marty Strange out in the rotunda, criticizing the depreciation schedules that we're using, according to the Department of Revenue under the way 1063