

February 13, 1996 LB 349, 1050

SENATOR COORDSEN: One minute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: ...or a percentage. But that will be a discussion in 1050. With all of the other difficulties and questions that are there, that would be there on 349, I'm not willing to make that jump yet. I would rather do with what we have in 1050, for the most part. Personally, I'd rather phase the income tax rebate, over a three-year period, to zero and put it all in equalization, but that's a minority view right now and not doable. But those are some of my reasons, though I understand the concept that people would say we should only pay if we have...it should be taken into consideration, an increase or decrease in state aid, based on the ability of the people to pay the tax. I understand the rationale for it. When it gets down to the practicality of how it would work and how it would effect, I can't go along with that at this point. So I'll be voting no on 349 for those reasons.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Matzke.

SENATOR MATZKE: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I strongly support this bill, I think it makes a lot of sense. I think the debate illustrates today that at the very bottom we all realize we have an outdated, archaic and unfair property tax system that relies too heavily on property for the support of our education programs in this state. This is one bill that tries to address the problem, I think it addresses it in a forthright and honest manner. What we're really talking about is what resources do we have and what resources should we look to, to education young people in this state. I come from a part of the state where we have a high incidence of hail. I have friends that have lost wheat crops for three years in a row, they have no revenue whatsoever from their land, yet it's counted as a resource for the determination of whether there should be state school aid to that area. The same is true if your milo crop is frozen or your corn is withered. Income is a more deliberate, a more accountable factor. I think that a fallacy of logic is being used as an attack on this bill. The concept that you can prove a principle by generalizing from one specific is a logical fallacy. And if you look at the examples being used of the wealthy man moving into one district, it proves nothing. That is the same argument that was used to support discrimination in this country. It is a logical fallacy