

April 7, 1992

LB 1063, 1092
LR 219

message plates just as they exist in statute now; \$75 if you want to pop for it in the first place, then \$35 to renew it. But I have to agree with Senator Bernard-Stevens on the rest of it. This really is a tax increase bill. That is what it is, and there are too many times when taxes that hit the public the hardest, in a manner of speaking, because it is when you go to do these essential things to be able to drive a car, they don't know about it until that occurs. None of this was discussed in the context of LB 1063, LR 219CA, or any of those others that were considered issues relative to taxation. Some of these fees, I think, as far as the amount they are being raised, are exorbitantly raised. I don't think by way of a hidden tax increase we should fund computer activity for the State Patrol. I don't see any connection whatsoever. And if the Colonel is afraid, or if the Governor told him not to, to seek an appropriation from the General Fund to carry out essential services and responsibilities of the State Patrol, that is a problem that has to be worked out by the administration. If on the other hand, this is boondoggle activity which they feel they cannot justify in going before the Appropriations Committee for funding for, then it should not be done in this way. So there are additional concerns I have with the bill, but I offered just that one amendment because Senator Bernard-Stevens had told me how he intended to divide the question. By his division of the question, we would then be able to take these things more in a rifle shot approach, so to speak, rather than scatter-gun. I didn't want to put up all of the proposed amendments that I have in mind because there are others who have expressed concerns about the bill too. So I think we need to take it as it comes, and what those who are on this bill need to realize is that a tax increase is a tax increase no matter how you phrase it or whatever you call it. That lady who wrote the poem said a rose is a rose is a rose. They applied that same philosophy when the first group that allegedly went to the moon came back. They had some rocks and they concluded after the expenditure of all that money and they looked at these rocks that a rock is a rock is a rock. So if that can be said about a rose, if it can be said about a rock, it can be said about this tax increase. The tax increase is as hard as a rock, but it does not have the smell of a rose. So, Senator Bernard-Stevens, I am going to support your division of the question. By that I meant, the discussion that will occur. You have a right, under the rules, to ask for a division of the question. It is not even voted on, and I think this clearly is divisible because there are two separate bills, and then we can take these fees each on its own merits. And I