

April 11, 1983

LB 560

or partnership, as most farmers do, would receive no benefit. Probably the biggest inequity of all is the fact that the small beginning farmer who is trying to expand would receive no benefit at all. Not only would these nonfamily farms be receiving more in the way of tax incentives, they would eventually be driving that small farmer, I spoke of, out of business. It is for this reason that the committee struck "feedlot" from the bill. But people had questions about whether or not a feedlot would fall under some other definition in the bill. My amendment would remove all doubt and state that feedlots definitely cannot receive benefits from this bill. I urge this body to adopt this amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, the Sieck amendment is agreeable. I think that it clarifies what the committee intended to do and it should be supported.

PRESIDENT: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, I wonder if Senator Sieck would respond to a question, please.

SENATOR SIECK: Yes.

SENATOR VICKERS: Senator Sieck, as I understand your amendment and what you were...as you explained it, it is your intention that the provisions of this act would not apply to a family farm corporation. Is that correct?

SENATOR SIECK: It would not apply to a family farm corporation.

SENATOR VICKERS: It would not apply anyhow?

SENATOR SIECK: I don't think it would because of the smallness of the fact, see, you only, you have to hire two...after you hire two people then you begin to get paid. So you would have to be a pretty large farm before you hired two extra people.

SENATOR VICKERS: You hire two people and invest \$100,000. Isn't that correct?

SENATOR SIECK: When you hire the third people then you start getting that exemption.