

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 24, 2003

LB 759

and commercial around one to one and a half, agriculture land of...the percent of the net income on agriculture land was 30 percent. It was a...really stood out there. And that's not on here right now. He also mentioned that the \$1,000 credit would amount to about \$1 million worth of assets. What he doesn't realize is that you...there's not too many farms that that's all paid for. if you put the liabilities against that, it would not be a net asset. And \$1 million in assets, or value of farmland in our area is about 400 acres, which is not even the average size of a farm. I just don't think it's good policy to start taxing something more, then trying to give it back, because as Senator Vrtiska mentioned, one size does not fit all. I know some people in our area that own some land, farm it. They also own some that they rent out. How do you determine what they farm, that you would get the exemption or the credit on and what you would not get the credit on? And as Senator Vrtiska mentioned, that he has some land that he rents out to somebody because he's retired. Many of the landowners in our area are cash rent. They could have that amount...the extra taxes that they would pay right on to the cash rent. The young farmer that's just getting started, probably borrows almost on the money on the land, would still have to pay those taxes, or else in the rent, increase that. So I don't think it's fair. One size does not fit all. When you get to agriculture, we still pay 100 percent on our house, just like anyone else, the residential. But we tax, rather than land, I'd like to call it our tools. But we have no choice but to have land to farm. And you almost have to rent...own some of it, because if you don't, you never know when it's going to be gone, and you don't have any place to farm. So we have to be paying taxes on the tools of our trade, which is our land. One other thing Senator Brashear mentioned is that \$100 million has been shifted to increase the state aid, which was a benefit to property tax. That was on purpose. That was the intention, because it was out of balance, (inaudible) 30 percent of your net income, was trying to shift it. There was a...we voted an amendment on the ballot I think about ten years ago that was going to take away...give some credit to agriculture property tax. And I remember the people that fought that were saying, we're all for that, but we don't want to shift. I think the intention has been, we need to shift. If something is out of balance, we just