

Nebraska. I think what Senator Schmit is attempting to do here is going to put more of a fiscal impact on the state and it's going to be a lot of extra confusion. Now, I don't think he had any fee increase as Senator Cudaback had stated in his. I think Senator Cudaback had talked about a 6 dollar a ton on anhydrous, but I didn't hear Senator Schmit make that comment that he was going to increase the fee on anhydrous by 2 dollars to make it from 4 to 6, but when he comes back in maybe he could answer that for somebody. But, anyway, I really have a big problem at the present time opening up this whole problem again. I would just as soon leave it where it is and let the farmers decide what they want to do with the CA as it is. Thank you.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Senator Withem is the next speaker.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, members of the body, I would rise in opposition to the Schmit amendment from probably a more broadly-based sort of concern as opposed to whether...how, in fact, fertilizers should be taxed. I don't really care what the methodology is of taxing fertilizer as long as the fiscal impact remains the same as it was when we passed LB 1063 and I would remind the body that there was an agreement that had been reached between a group of rural senators and a group of urban senators dealing with the issue of farm machinery and whether or not we tax farm machinery and the agreement was we will...we'll tax farm machinery sales tax but you can get a rebate. You can get a hundred percent rebate provided that the funds that are raised to cover the General Fund deficit are raised with a combination of general impact taxes and taxes that are specifically oriented to the ag sector, and that was acceptable by a number...a number of senators and they are the ones that hit upon the fertilizer tax as the agriculture...the agriculture senators' contribution to paying the General Fund deficit created by the refund on farm machinery. And I forget what all the dollar amounts were, but we agreed on how much the fertilizer tax would raise and the fertilizer tax was then imposed. If the manner in which it was drafted was improper, if there are better ways of administering it, I'm willing to listen to those, provided that the fiscal impact remains the same. And if Senator Schmit would have a way of adjusting the rate but decreasing the base so those dollars would be raised would be the same I probably wouldn't care a great deal. It's probably something that I would feel...feel comfortable doing. But to come back in a couple of weeks after that agreement was made where we did capitulate and to some extent on dealing with the