

taxes. Some people wanted people to believe that the court is making agriculture pay more taxes, and I guess I want to see some people that are supporting this compromise that makes ag pay 8, 10, 15 million dollars, you know, I want them to go back home and say why it has to be that way. Don't blame the court for it. That's not the reason. That is not the reason at all. The court said our property tax classification system or if you want to believe you had a property tax problem that never ever said ag has to pay more money, and you know it is only because the Legislature chose to make ag pay more money and because, in my opinion, because the Governor has acquiesced saying he wants something to happen, he doesn't care if ag pays more money. Those are the reason that agriculture is paying more money. Now, Senator Warner is right. There has been several bills introduced that have everybody in the state share in the cost of solving this problem and in those plans, the agricultural sector does pay something, that is a true statement, but they are paying something to make a step forward in tax policy. With LB 1063, they pay something to make a step backwards, and just that makes no sense to me whatsoever, other than the fact that is the political will of this body, that is fine, other than the fact that because the administration, basically, says whatever it takes, if ag pays more, that is no skin off my back, it is those type of things that tend to...if fewer (inaudible) people that need to know, the only reason ag is paying more money under 1063 is because this body said they had to, and the Nelson administration let that happen. The second misconception is a misconception that was, once again, in the editorial page of the Omaha World-Herald this morning. I had several well-intentioned constituents calling me up, and let it be said, I have never been one...I have never ever, ever said I am going to vote against the constitutional amendment just for the sake of doing so to keep it off the ballot, never ever said that. I have never encouraged people to do that. It's a private decision that all of us need to make. I have said as a private individual I am not going to vote for it. I never will. Unless something changes dramatically, I never will. But it is one of those things that this body has been led to believe time and time again, you only have two choices. You have the choice of the 3-R plan, or putting everything back on. And there may be many people of the opinion that if a constitutional amendment is not passed with 40 votes, that is tantamount to putting things back on the tax rolls. If nothing has happened, that is true but, obviously, the next motion can be, will be, and should be a motion to exempt all personal property for tax year '92. That