

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

May 19, 2003

LB 596

SENATOR LANDIS: That sounds to me as if it is, in a relatively rare set of circumstances, likely. That's true. But that is one of our problems here. Are you a direct mirror of the federal system, or not? And we were a direct mirror of the federal system for 20 years. And we've found that it made our tax code more volatile, and budgeting more difficult, so that in the Orr years, we specifically went away from mirroring federal tax liability, which made all of the accounting very simple. It collapsed completely federal and state differences.

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: There were no state-federal differences. And we did it that way for 20 years. But what we found was that we could not budget year to year, in which our tax code was being rewritten by the federal government, and then finding that our revenues went up and down based on federal law. So it is a difficulty, and there are some accounting difficulties created by a depreciation schedule that the feds use, and a depreciation schedule that we'll use, because we're going to ask them to do add-backs. It is confusing. But what we get is greater stability in our revenue system, and greater self-determination, if you will. But if you want to describe it that way, you're right, it's at the cost of some accounting difficulty.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. Thank you, Senator Landis. My only proposed solution, I guess, would be...

SPEAKER BROMM: Time. Sorry, Senator Raikes. Senator Beutler, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bromm, I'd finish...I'd yield the first part of my time to Senator Raikes to finish his remarks.

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Raikes.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Senator Beutler and Mr. Speaker and members. Would there be some way, I guess I was going to ask, that this add-back period be confined to the length of the asset? So if you had a three-year asset rather than having a