

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

March 22, 2006 LB 968

time. However, it is true if this...if the committee has overguessed the tolerance of this body for tax cuts, we should go back to the drawing board and make that adjustment. I will be looking to this vote as that signal. In the event Senator Beutler is successful, I will ask the Revenue Committee to meet in further Executive Sessions and look for ways of downsizing the tax proposal. I think I will be treating this motion to bracket as that signal from the body. My impression from the body, however, is that in fact this is a political agenda sufficiently broad, attractive and reflective of their constituents' interests, so much so that they would like to see this passed in some form--perhaps this one, perhaps a different one--and that we make other adjustments in our thinking to conform to this one. I think Senator Beutler's notion is, look, do all the rest of the analysis, do all the rest of the spending and the saving, and then what's left is a tax cut. I understand that and I recognize it. However, if you were to think of this as a spending priority, you would make the rest of the adjustments to the budget sufficient to conform to this priority, and I'm going to guess that the bottom shares...the body shares my perspective that it's the latter, not the former; that this is a legitimate, appropriate way to commit this amount of money to achieve social ends, whether those social ends are to encourage construction and refurbishment of houses in a way that states around us do not, whether it is in the creation of an earned income tax credit to help working women, in particular, whether it's to relieve some of the extraordinary burden that our wealthy taxpayers pay in this state, compared to other states, or whether or not it's to assist farmers and rural agricultural land owners in paying for the public services--particularly for schools--that we expect from them with our current property tax system, or whether we'll reduce the amount of valuation that is taxable to them. My guess is that those constitute social values worth making commitments and spending for. I'll be voting no on the bracket motion, but I think Senator Beutler has fairly placed the question before us. If the motion is successful, I certainly would ask, in the intervening time, for the Revenue Committee to get together and to look to downsize the proposal and throw some of those ideas out of the lifeboat. I would, however, find it of value between now and the closing to have Senator Beutler identify for me what