

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

April 1, 2005

LR 2

Senator Landis has stood before and said, as the Chair of the committee, the Revenue Committee, it is his responsibility to protect the tax base. And I do believe we need to do that. I don't believe it's the government's role to get involved in discriminating between different entities in our state, but I do believe that the amendment that is before us would further that discrimination between even entities that provide the same service to the citizenry. So I am not going to support the amendment, but I am not going to support the bill. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Redfield. Senator Chambers, on your amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, my mind is boggled--concern for eroding the tax base, but not concerned about eroding one of the fundamental principles of the federal government and this state government. You are eroding the separation between the state and religion. This language starts out, as I pointed out before, notwithstanding any other provision in the constitution. Why did they put that in? Because they want to undermine an existing provision in the constitution. I wish other people on this floor cared about the constitution to the extent that I do. What does "primarily" mean? Fifty-one percent. Forty-nine percent can be religion and it's all right. Here's what you have to understand. You are not creating a public entity. You are not creating a public facility open to everybody. Senator Landis' example of the public schools falls on its face because the public schools belong to everybody, not a particular entity. When they talk about a nonprofit, they don't mean somebody is not making a profit. There are people who work there. They make a living. There are salaries paid. The value of their holdings may increase. So profit is a misnomer, to my way of thinking. They do get financial benefits not available to others. And they can choose not to hire certain people if they want to because those people don't comply with their religious dogmas. And you want me to let the constitution be eroded so that these churches can discriminate. These church-based businesses can discriminate. And you mean to tell me you think, as wily, as tricky as they are in finding ways to evade the existing law, that they would not play havoc with this word "primarily"? They wouldn't know