

the other corporations were not and the senators were not willing to accept it because they thought agriculture didn't pick up enough. But there are corporations in agriculture also, a lot of them, and they would be paying a lot of this extra tax. So, like I said, I don't have as much problem with how we're going to go about it as much as I do where it's going to be applied and when it's going to be applied and why it's okay one day but not okay 30 days ago. So I don't know what I'm going to do about this amendment because I realize the money needs to be raised. But it just points out another problem with LB 1063, as it has been mentioned here before, that we're going to be coming back time after time after time trying to help raise funds, trying to work out LB 1063. And I guess it's really no wonder why the voters of Nebraska are very confused and why they don't know how they're going to vote because the Legislature doesn't know how we're going to raise the funds, how are things going to happen. So it's really no, I guess, surprise that the voters also are very upset and disturbed about what's happening down here. So, I guess, I'm going to have to decide what I do with this amendment, but I can just...kind of upsetting why it's okay one place and not the other. Thank you.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator Schellpeper. Senator Bernard-Stevens, please.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. President, I yield my time to Senator Warner.

SENATOR CONWAY: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: (Microphone not activated) ...Stevens. I want to repeat again because there are things being said that are totally irrelevant to this amendment. The purpose of this amendment was one purpose and for two years was to replenish the Cash Reserve Fund which LB 1068 transferred four and a half million. The cause of the cash flow and why it is only temporary was because the refund on new and used farm equipment goes back to January 1 of 1992 and you were covering an initial 18-month period as far as the General Fund and the fiscal year of the state, with receipts that are in place in LB 1063 on an ongoing basis as a balance of the General Fund was held relatively harmless. But the receipts from the ongoing tax would not replace the 18-month period of the refund but it does approximately replace on an ongoing basis the 14.6 million at 12 months. So there simply is no problem and that's why it is