

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Vickers, please.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President and members, the amendment that we're debating right now, and I believe it is just now being handed out to you, is a different amendment than you had laid on your desk just before we broke for lunch. The amendment that was laid on your desk just before we broke for lunch, and I think that's the amendment that Senator Johnson was just looking at although the points that he was making are exactly the same. The amendment that was laid on your desk before we broke for lunch had language in the part of the amendment that was to be put on the ballot, that was to be put on the ballot, that indicated that it was due to the passage of Amendment 4 and due to the subsequent passage of LB 271 by the Legislature that this question needed to be decided. I read that amendment before we left for lunch and I said, you know, that's wrong because what that says is we're telling the folks at the ballot box that it is due to the actions of the Legislature that all this took place and I suggest to you that because of the economic conditions that we're in in agriculture because of the fact that valuations are dropping no matter how you value them, that that question might have to be answered by some of the voters in some of the counties anyhow. So I don't think it is all totally due to Amendment 4 or LB 271. So because of that I asked for a redraft of the amendment. I asked that they put in a better language which I think you now have before you and it says that when the total actual valuation of all land in a county decreases due to the implementation of a new agricultural land valuation manual. Now, even though my name is on this amendment and even though I think it's a much better amendment than the other one, I think what Senator Johnson just got through saying is correct. I think it is bad policy. I don't think it is a good idea for this Legislature to tell county boards you simply cannot do anything if that happens and you're bumping up against a fifty cent levy limitation other than you shall have an election. Now I think that it would be much better if we would have said you may have an election, but I'm told that is completely unnecessary. They can do that already. I think we need to understand that it is possible for a county board to have to go into their budget and reduce their budget much as we may have to do and much as we have done in the past. I don't think there is anything wrong with that. Now I understand the position of some of the county folks