

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

May 5, 2005

LB 425

have. Now Senator Pederson pointed this out. There's a big goose egg under the property tax relief provision of the budget, and Senator Raikes had a bill that was passed and we all supported it--some of us did, some of us in those smaller communities didn't--but that was supposed to have \$2.9 million restored in 2006. That money is not in the bill. That money is not in the budget. That was a part of the process that we made, and most of us who are here now were here then. That was the deal, and that was the deal that we had made within our body that when the times turned around, that money would be restored. Senator Mines brings us another one of those options, that we had an opportunity to make that decision. And when we made that decision, there were assumptions about what would happen in the future. So I don't oppose Senator Mines' idea because he's doing it. I think it's well within his right. In fact, there are going to be others that are offering amendments. We've had those. There will probably be more that will continue to offer amendments to try to restore money. Whether they come from specific areas as former city officials, former county officials, or other areas of interest, that's going to be a natural tendency of this process is to try to restore or try to right some wrongs that were done. We're also making restitution or we're trying to restore funding in other areas, higher education. We're trying to continue to fund areas like state aid to schools, and we're trying to continue to do those things, and I think that's appropriate. You know what's not being discussed? We discussed at the process of passing LB 1085 that those tax increases we passed would be temporary. That was part of a deal. That was part of the deal with the citizens of the state of Nebraska. We're not keeping that deal, Senator Mines. We're not keeping that deal, members of the Legislature. That frustrates me. Now the logical argument will be, well, if we do that, it makes the out years look worse. Depends on your state of mind, it depends on the economic philosophy that you buy into. But if we're going to be consistent, and if you're going to buy into the argument that Senator Mines gives you today, that a deal is a deal, then those of us who were here at the time when those deals were made should keep them. And if we're not going to keep them on all, then we should choose to decide the public policy in which we're going to deviate, because we're obviously going to deviate on tax policy. We flat out are. So