

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

May 13, 2003

LB 759

vertical cuts at another and make it the poor Legislature who doesn't know how to do either. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Brashear. Senator Preister, on your amendment.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the body, I appreciate that this is a new day, this is a new vote and, although a majority did pass this once, I can't assume that that's going to happen again at this point. There have been discussions over the weekend. I have had some. I know we've all thought about this. We're looking at doing something that no matter what do is going to cause pain to somebody. If we cut programs, it's going to hurt the people that benefit from those programs. If we cut the...if we increase the taxes, that's going to impact those people that have to pay those taxes. If it's on the services on repairs of older automobiles, I think it's going to impact a lot of people who are already struggling, and I don't choose to do that. I, likewise, don't want to see a shift onto property tax, because that does seem to be the most onerous of all the taxes, and when you pay it in a big chunk you notice the volume of it and you notice it very dramatically, and that too does impact low-income folks. I appreciate, very much so, the work that Senator Brashear has done on LB 759 and his whole interest in how we raise our revenue and also how we spend those tax dollars from the constituents that we represent. I appreciate the challenge of what we're about and the sacrifices that we're making in trying to come up with those solutions to solving our budget challenges. In the interest of what we're doing here, I think Senator Brashear is absolutely right. We should know the dollar amount that we're talking about. The figures that I have are between seven and ten million that this would either raise or we would be taking out of this bill. That is a sizeable amount of money. It's a sizeable amount that we would generate. It's also a sizeable amount that would come out of the pockets of low-income people. In the spirit of finding a solution, I'm willing to look at compromise. I think that the way the drafting was done, was done just to make it convenient and easy when I either strike "include" and then insert "exclude" motor vehicles. Motor vehicles are very broad. Motor vehicles probably include go-carts, golf-carts. They include