

SENATOR CONWAY: You are so recognized.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. I took the unusual course for me of asking for a call of the house because this will wind up being a controversial measure and you're going to want to have a chance to think about it and reflect on it to know what it is before we vote. I put out yesterday a copy of this amendment and I also sent out a summary of its provisions. Let me tell you what it does. It keeps the corporate filing assessment idea in place for two more years and reshapes what that filing will be. It adds...what it does is it will keep, for those corporations that have from ten to \$125,000 of paid up capital stock, they will have a \$30 assessment; \$60 for 125,000 to 350,000; \$90 for 350,000 to 10 million; and \$120 for 10 million and above. This is a progressive system as opposed to what we did in 825 which was a nonprogressive system. Secondly, it cuts out nonprofits. They do not pay taxes. Third, foreign corporations pay double this amount. That's by existing law. It raises \$2.2 million at the best guess of our Secretary of State. Why do we need the money? We need the money because we will...we have already in a law that we passed this year taken out of the Cash Fund an amount of about 4 million bucks. We will need to replenish that amount of money in the next two years. Otherwise, our permanent cash reserve...our...there's a name for this fund, thank you, the Cash Reserve Fund will be down this amount of money. This gets us back to even keel. Senator Moore, who is not a proponent of these general...this general trend of law does find this appropriate fiscal policy to do. For those of you who harbor ill will about LB 1063, I hope you will consider that this is simply a matter of balancing the books for the state with taxpayers who generally, at least, in their representatives out in the rotunda have agreed to this notion, they have supported the idea of using the corporate filing fee. The State Chamber supports this concept. With respect to the question of why we do this, we do this to fund the farm machinery sales tax exemption. Let me say that again for those of you who may have some problems in this. The reason we need to do this is because we need to balance the books because of the farm machinery sales tax exemption. If that provision was not in LB 1063, we wouldn't have to do this at all. But in an attempt to accommodate various parts of this body, we made that change, it created a cash flow problem. This solves the cash flow problem. I hope everyone will share in that obligation of making the books balance. Whether or not you agree with the original