

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Senator Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. President and members, don't leave, Howard, this is one that you asked for and I thought I would offer it. This amendment would provide \$14,049,000. It would provide it through a property tax. What it simply does is change the ag land values from 80 percent to 85 percent. I sort of copied Senator Schmit's original efforts or previous efforts on the floor. Now what we have to think about here is that the concern seems to be that we associate apples and apples and oranges and oranges, and it should be a property tax responsibility and shouldn't be a pop tax, it shouldn't be a highway tax, although we all know that it was a sales tax, not a gas tax, so, therefore, that sales tax could be applied anywhere we wanted it to. But in 1991 we had nineteen billion, nine hundred and forty-one million, approximately, dollars worth of valuation. In 1992, we had a little less than that. Even though some land sold in Senator Wehrbein's neighborhood for \$1,600 an acre when it was really worth about \$1,200 an acre, unfortunately, Roger, the land values statewide went from \$14,900,000,000 to \$14,642,000,000. Five percent of that simply put the 5 percent back on. It would mean we could put 732 million back on the tax rolls. We estimate, by the way, in 1974 that ag land values for tax purposes at 80 percent would be a little over \$15 billion. Now if you're looking for an alternative, and I know not too many people are really serious about this kind of an alternative, but, you know, we should talk about all the possible alternatives there, just not pop and just not gas tax monies or highway funds or beer. You know, we haven't talked about taxing farm machinery. We haven't talked about taxing a lot of things that we already discussed in LB 1063. But I think it's important for us to recognize that this would be one way to resolve the issue. And what it would do also is provide more income for school districts at the local level because they would be taxing at 85 percent rather than 80. The only problem we have in a couple of the Class I school districts in Howard Lamb's district, the possibility exists with this money since I...to be equally frank, the amendment doesn't provide that the money be pooled. It goes back to the school districts. And there were a number of people that suggested whatever we do should be in the form of school aid. So this amendment provides for that. But in one of Howard Lamb's districts, the possibility exists that a teacher could be making \$90,000 a year if this passed and I'm not sure that's quite...that isn't quite enough for him to give up farming to go back to teaching school,