

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members. Again I rise to oppose Senator Elmer's amendment. Senator Lamb pointed out the issue of the cost of this amendment and I stand solid on my statement that this is a \$5 million hit to this package, plain and simple. Senator...and as I stated in my response to Senator Elmer's question earlier, had we not paid out \$97 million already to local subdivisions, that very well would be true, the argument that this is a local issue in terms of it's a local tax, it would be reduced and then have to be, if you will, transferred to real property or to other sources or to just the overall rate schedule. But since we've already paid it out, we have to make that money up and this is one way that we make it up. Although it is not a direct reduction, if you will, in terms of the local subdivisions, it is indirect to the state and we are looking at \$5.1 million that with the adoption of the Elmer amendment is no longer there. On a going forward basis, Senator Lamb's argument would be absolutely accurate. The problem is, is that we're out of pocket \$97 million to date. All we're trying to do with LB 1 is raise the revenue necessary to offset what we have sent to local subdivisions to ensure that property taxes stay at the level that they were prior to January 1 of 1992 or as close as possible, based on budget limitations and expectations from the local subdivisions as they relate to state aid. So, with that, again I would urge you to oppose Senator Elmer's amendment. It does have a \$5.1 million impact.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President. I will be brief. As all of you know, I have always supported the exemption from taxation of livestock for a variety of reasons, equitable reasons and reasons that just simply make common sense. Most of these breeding livestock are not truly depreciable property in the way we normally think of that. But in the larger context of what we're doing here today, I think it also makes sense to reconsider the exemption of livestock because 829, as it was originally passed, I think all of us loved various portions of that more than others, but now we're seeing 829 in a kind of a new form and we are taking away millions of dollars and giving them to the centrally assessed taxpayers. I think it is appropriate that we consider the balance that 829 has to have in order to get through this body. As I view 829 right now, it is seriously unbalanced and if we