

May 5, 1989

LB 84

SENATOR MOORE: Pass.

PRESIDENT: Senator Withem. Senator Lamb following that.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, just very briefly. I have not spoken yet today and maybe will comment on the Chambers amendment and will then maybe make a generalized comment in defense of some of my colleagues. Number one, is I'm going to oppose the Chambers amendment. It probably isn't a substantive amendment, it does not change what the bill will do. So it's probably not going to do any serious damage to the bill, if this amendment were adopted. I happen to agree with the statement, it will reduce the property tax burden for the citizens of Nebraska. It will reduce it by \$98 million. Doesn't say it's massive property tax reduction, it doesn't say it will cure the end of the world...will cure all of our ills, it's a simple statement of fact and I think it is a true fact. The reduction will be for the public good is a matter of opinion. When we pass legislation stating intent of the legislation, or legislative findings we quite often enact our opinion into the statute. That is our opinion, that is my opinion, so I'm going to vote to retain the legislation in the bill and will be voting against the Chambers amendment. The other comment I want to make is I guess four of our colleagues that have labored long and hard on this bill have come under some attack on the floor of the Legislature for having the audacity to eat lunch together in the same room and actually, actually talk about legislative business when they're not on the floor of the Legislature. Maybe there's a code some place that we're not supposed to...we're supposed to say "King's X" when one of our colleagues comes up to us and wants to talk about what's in a legislative bill and what we ought to do about it. Anybody that has been around this body for any length of time knows that that is part of our process, and it's a valuable part of our process to attempt to discuss pieces of legislation off the floor and arrive at some sort of a compromise. If, when that compromise comes back, we don't like it, as Senator McFarland obviously doesn't like it, you don't have to accept it, and you shouldn't. You should attempt to change it, you should attempt to vote it down, but somehow, particularly in Senator McFarland's statements that somehow something evil has gone on here because some colleagues have decided to attempt to work out their differences, I think is uncalled for, and I think it's unfair. You know, attack the product, if you don't like the product. But the process has