

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

May 6, 2003

LB 285

phenomena of the last two years, which is an historic first in terms of its depth and length, does not enable us to keep that reduced income tax and stay on track with property tax reform. But I hope the Legislature still has, as its primary objective, control of property taxes, and if that is your primary objective still then I think it behooves us not to adopt this amendment and to continue the income tax. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Janssen.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Members of the Legislature, I, too, was here when we lowered the income tax. I remember that very well, and it was the right thing to do at that time. The first amendment that year was to lower the income tax to the rate that we were here a year ago, and I felt as though at that time not only should the income tax be lowered but I, you know, what about the general public who pays sales tax every day? I felt as though they should have some consideration also, so I introduced that amendment to lower the sales tax. That lasted for about a year, and then it was...that portion was brought back for a specific reason. But I can understand now, you know, it was so much easier then to lower that and as always. And, you know, when I went back to my constituents that year after the session was over, very little was said about the fact that we had lowered the income tax and the sales tax, but, boy, we sure heard it last year when we brought part of that back in LB 1085. So that's what we've all...we all have to face. And with the two proposals that we have before us, you know, it kind of reminds me of a couple of trains going down a set of tracks and they're both going to the same destination. They're both carrying the same payload, but if something would happen along the way, one of those would hit a loose tie or something and derail, you'd still have the other train going to the same destination. So I am comfortable with moving these two proposals ahead. I'm confident that this is going to be a proposal that when you go home people are going to say, I knew that you'd do that; you should have cut more. You know, we spent a couple of days making cuts, and some of them were pretty darn painful to a lot of agencies. We've got our property tax payers out there that, if we do much more derailling, you understand what's going to happen there. You