

April 2, 1996

LB 299, 1050, 1114  
LR 292

you will have a bigger shift, and then the outcry from the rural areas will get larger. I think what we've done in the past is fair. This mainly puts it in the constitution where I think we can all be comfortable with it, and it does not say we cannot reduce valuations. It just says we cannot increase how property is taxed beyond the 100 percent for commercial and residential and it cannot be increased past 80 percent. Maybe there is a hidden agenda out there, and the only thing I can think of is that there is members of this body that want to increase agricultural valuations for tax purposes to 90 or 100 percent, or, who knows, if you have the power down the road, 120 percent. We all know that when land is sold everybody pays too much of it...to much for it. You can't make more farmland, but you can build another house. That's the reason ag land sells for more than what it is worth. But you can build another house, you can build another gas station, so they'll never be...they'll never sell for more than their replacement value. I think we are sending the wrong message if we vote to reconsider, I really do, and I know you're sending the wrong message to rural Nebraska. Thank you.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. I have been very surprised at the chain of events. I did vote for Senator Schrock's amendment, and as I cast the vote, I thought, well, this is...this is okay because really this is what we're doing now, and it seems to be a well-accepted principle that we are going to go with 80 percent on agricultural land and 100 percent on the rest of the property, so we're really not doing anything other than just confirming what we've been...what the practice has been and what the policy decision has been, maybe granting some...a little bit more certainty to those people that feel uncomfortable about this entire legislation. You know I don't know about all the senators who are standing up and saying that this ruins the package and all this and that, but I am not sure that they all have the number of small towns, the number of rural schools, the number of rural people that I have in my district who look at the printouts on LB 1050, who look at the effects of LB 1114, who look at LB 299, then they say, how are we going to exist? And I have to tell them, well, trust us because in a couple of years, within the next year or two, we're going to do what we have to do, after we look at all the efficiencies, to come back and provide the necessary