

November 9, 1992 LB 1

SENATOR SCHROCK: So we did some things that were very distasteful to us at the time and I don't know when the time will come to correct that. But I don't know what I'm supposed to say to my farmer constituents out there when I see what's happened to them in the last two years. And when I see that if we would move or if we could move them, which we can't, if we could move our farm to Kansas or Iowa, our total tax bill would be substantially smaller. I know that I've talked to a lot of machinery dealers in the area and they say that disincentive to purchase new machinery or even buy used machinery is not there anymore because of the personal property taxes which are imposed upon anybody who adds to their personal property tax inventory. So I'm looking for ways to remedy some situations to provide for some relief. We're looking at \$2 corn or less. I heard the market report come in this morning. We went all the way from \$1.90 to...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR SCHROCK: ...about 2.03 in the state this last week.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President and members of the Legislature, just, you know, two or three points. We've had a number of people discussing that we should look at the overall tax structure. I have no disagreement with that as a general position. But if we're going to do that, then let's go back and look what was the situation in this state on January 1 of 1992. And those who are expressing concern about what was done with the constitutional amendment seem to have already forgotten what would have been the case if we had not done that. If those who felt that they had an unjust burden from the implementation of the taxing of personal property by a depreciable value what would have been their concern, what would have been their attitude had we done nothing? The load on agriculture would have been significantly higher, significantly different. As I recall, roughly, half of the value for inventory was agriculture. The livestock industry that we were discussing the feeder side of it probably, in fact, would have left the state. So it isn't a case, as we like to portray, that some equity from a far more inequitable situation, in fact, that was achieved, that there was greater equity than what we had. There are a couple, three things that specifically concerns me about this