

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

May 13, 2003

LB 759

and Bill Drafters suggested that the original amendment just needed to be located in a different section of the bill, although it is the same amendment. AM1831 would do the same thing that we have done once earlier in Senator Landis' bill, and that is to remove the charge on repair labor on motor vehicles. The bill itself simply changes "including" and inserts "excluding" motor vehicles from the provisions of the sales tax on those services. So, in essence, what we're doing is saying that motor vehicles and the repair service labor will not be taxed. It was an amendment that I proposed on Senator Landis' bill and that the body approved, but because we have this two-track system now, we're having one set of bills where we're amending and then we go through on LB 759 and the same thing has to be done, if the body chooses to. So at this point, that's the essence of what the bill does. The rationale is the same as it was when I introduced it and when we had the discussion earlier on Senator Landis' bill, and my concern is that we have people with older vehicles and those older vehicles require more repairs and those repairs are sometimes difficult to pay for by people who are struggling. Those low-income folks who rely on those vehicles for transportation to their jobs, frequently one or two or three different jobs, sometimes because the jobs don't pay health insurance or other benefits, and they are at an economic disadvantage as a result of the amount of income that they can make and they're dependent upon those vehicles for transportation. So the repair cost and the cost of additional tax on top of those repair costs is something that has a direct impact on them. I think it's important that we help those people, that we not further penalize them in terms of the additional cost, and that they can continue to drive those vehicles and to have those vehicles in use when they can't afford to actually have a new one, which would cost them even more. I do it for that reason. I propose the amendment because I want to not further take money out of the pockets of people who can least afford it. I do it for a second reason, and that's a philosophical reason. I think it's important that we encourage things to be used, and used to their full longevity rather than what's frequently a economic policy of consume, consume, consume; that frequently we don't value things that have previous use. We don't always value the used things, but we tend to place more emphasis on new and improved, on bigger,