

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

March 30, 2005 LB 753

bill. I would tell you that good government is not about playing "gotcha" with its citizens. We have, in fact, a situation that was not as clear as we believe it should have been. When LB 759 was passed, there was a great deal of confusion, and there was difficulty with implementation. That is the reason why we had to come back last year and address it and design the clear bright line that Senator Landis explained to you. If we found it necessary to come back legislatively and create that clear bright line, I don't believe that it is unusual for us to expect that our citizenry might have also experienced some confusion. I would ask you to adopt this. I believe it's fair, it's good government. And I would draw your attention to the committee amendment, which shows you that the Revenue Committee voted unanimously. Senator Connealy was absent, but everyone there is in support of the bill. There were no opponents to this bill. I think it's good government. It's fair. We want to make sure we collect the taxes that are due, but make sure that people understand when they are due, so that they can follow the rules to the best of their ability. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Redfield. Senator Stuthman, your light is next.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Thank you, Mr. (sic) President, members of the body. The discussion this morning leads me to think that what was done several years ago in LB 759 was realistically not a very clear-cut message to our taxpayers. And I'm referring to LB 759, the sales tax on the reconstruction, remodeling labor; not very simple, interpreted in many ways; created a real problem for the accounting and the bookkeeping system, because we had almost a promise that it was going to relieve us of \$50 million of burden towards our debt, that this revenue would be generated. I don't feel we have an accurate record of how much...how many dollars that really, really was supposed to bring in. I do not know if we can really account as to how many dollars it did bring in. A year ago, we passed one that clarified certain parts of that bill. This year, we're back again. We've got one part that isn't very clear again, the telecommunications part of it. We're taking that part of it out. The fact that that was supposed to generate \$6 million of