

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

May 6, 2003

LB 379

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I agree with what Senator Hartnett said. I didn't think we should have lowered the income tax when we did. Many of our decisions are political. It was felt by Governor Johanns at one point that the state was rolling in so much dough that they ought to give money back to the taxpayers, enough to go get a dinner at Dundee Dell in Omaha or the Pantry in Lincoln and the Dairy Queen in Wahoo. I'm trying to remember as many as I can. My feeling... (laugh) I get out enough. (Laughter) When that money was being given back, I thought it would be best to hold it so that, when we did make use of it, it could go toward something in a way that would show a result. But to fritter it away for a political purpose was not wise. The Legislature did not stand against that. So we send in haste, now we repent in leisure, at leisure. These other bills have gone across to be a part of the later discussion to provide maximum flexibility. This bill should receive the same treatment. I did not discuss much the other bill. I do feel strongly about the income tax. It is never a pleasure to raise taxes, but considering everything that's on the table, the realities that we face, we should be able to enact Senator Hartnett's bill into law with a song in our hearts and a smile on our faces. I'm going to see how the body deals with Senator Hartnett's bill, and I'm going to see if those who spoke long and well about retaining maximum flexibility really feel that way or if that was just a trick to sucker people such as myself, who can sometimes be a pushover. There is a bill following this one. If this one doesn't go across the board to be a part of the flexibility that everybody has talked about, I don't believe the one that follows it should go across the board. And that's where they will be talking about repair services and so forth. Now that may not be too important since that other bill just before this one went across. As people were calculating, it might bring in \$350 million if everything goes as planned and desired. So it may be felt that Senator Hartnett's bill is not needed. Some amendments were not adopted to that other bill because everybody wanted maximum flexibility, even though some of it was redundant when you consider what's in Senator Brashear's bill. I've tried to be collegial today, I really have, but if this bill is dropped out of the equation, collegiality on my part goes out the window. I'm not going to have much to say on the bill