

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 26, 1999 LB 271

hasn't seen the same set of circumstances that I think voters across the state saw when they adopted the constitutional amendment. They saw a government looking like a private person, not being subjected to the same constraints, not being subject to the same burdens, and said that isn't fair. And it isn't fair, but if you adopt the Tyson amendment, you will say all of that is okay and go to it. Go out and acquire property, go out and...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: ...lease property, look like a private person, do everything you can to act like a private person but don't be treated like one.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Raikes.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Madam President and members of the Legislature. I rise also to oppose the Tyson amendment. Again I would remind you that the idea here with this bill is to lay out the basic concept, the basic framework statutorily as to how we intend to address this issue. Senator Tyson's amendment would greatly violate, I would say, the concepts and the philosophy that has gone into the bill up to this point, certainly through several discussions in the Revenue Committee and, of course, much discussion here on the floor. He did mention one thing that I wanted to pursue just a little bit. He mentioned that government entities were out there holding and leasing property, using the revenue to reduce property taxes. Well, I think it's worth pursuing this a little bit. The thought is, or the implication I think is that if a government entity is no longer required to obtain lease revenues without having paid taxes, that somehow everybody else's property taxes are going to go up. Well, I don't see that as logically following at all. If the government entity pays property taxes, then there's additional property on the property tax rolls and, presumably, unless there's an increase in the costs of local government services some way, that would be a wash. And generally speaking, I think that is true with this bill, that the revenue implications are largely neutral. Really, the issue here is...is trying to...to treat private citizens who compete with government in an equitable fashion, and also to treat