

SENATOR MCFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, fellow senators. I'd like to just respond to the whole fudge factor. I've heard that term enough I'm getting tired of it. Yes, it was discussed as a fudge factor. Was supposed to be 8 to 10 million dollars, I recall that debate. And all I can say now is what I said back then, if you look at the sheet I passed around I said all of those particular euphemisms translate for the middle income people into a tax increase. Revenue neutrality, under LB 773, if it's enacted in its present form with amendments, will translate into a tax increase for middle income Nebraskans. Revenue adjustment will translate into a tax increase for middle income Nebraskans. Revenue enhancement will translate into a tax increase for middle income Nebraskans, and then I said, or a tolerance factor or a fudge factor, it translates into a tax increase for middle income and middle class Nebraskans like you and me. Also, we not only had an 8 to 10 million dollar tax increase, we had more like a 25 to 30 million dollar tax increase at a minimum. That's the kind of tax increase we had. So I can understand why the general public is suspicious of politicians and their reputation for truth and voracity, which isn't very good when I hear debate on the floor today to try and justify the mistakes that were made two years ago. And I would also counter that there was no need to change the system we were under. The percentage of federal tax liability system that we were under was simple, it was fair, it was administratively cost-effective. Three other states used that system besides Nebraska. Not one of those three other states changed their system when there was a change in the federal income tax system in 1986. As I recall, they were Rhode Island, Vermont, and I think Connecticut, I'm not exactly sure on all three, but I think those are the three states. Not one of them changed their tax system. They are still using that system that we used back in 1986, and they are using it effectively. The third thing I'd like to say is that right now we have a lot of bills and spending projects that we do not know whether they're going to be passed and signed, or whether they are going to be vetoed. We have a fine arts center that is scheduled for construction up in Omaha that I'm sure a lot of people would like to see passed and not vetoed. We have some work on the capital construction on the College of Business Administration here at the University of Nebraska that is long overdue. I'd like to see that pass and I'd like to see that not be vetoed. There is a provision for a Trailside museum in western Nebraska that I'm sure a lot of senators would like to see passed and not vetoed. There are provisions in other bills, the teachers salary bill, there is