

May 23, 1983

LB 27

CLERK: 7 ayes, 29 nays, Mr. President, to overrule the Chair.

PRESIDENT: Motion fails and the Chair must say that the Senator is not precluded by this ruling from offering the amendment in his own right. Now we're discussing the Warner amendment to the bill. Senator, where are we now, Senator? Senator Warner, if there's no objection, if there no one else wishes to speak on this motion, I'd recognize Senator Warner to close. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: (Motion inaudible).

PRESIDENT: The motion is to recess until 1:30. All those in favor say aye. Opposed no. Motion failed. Chair recognizes Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would like to have Senator Warner use just a little bit of time and discuss why, in fact, he would like to pull Section 1 which use to be the bill out of LB 27. I think it will enlighten some people in terms of what LB 27 does, how it totally defeats the original purpose of LB 27 and why Senator Warner feels the need to, to separate the issue. Would you like to take my time, Senator Warner or would you like to have your own time to do that? If you would just take a few minutes, I'd like to close. I'd like to have just a minute of my own time. You take mine and just kind of explain it real briefly and then I'll...

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, as I understand my assignment is to again, repeat the purpose of the amendment and very frankly it is this, that in the event LB 27 would pass as it is currently amended, included in with the amendment that affects the corporate income tax would include the original bill and the original bill, as I've indicated a couple three times, only affected when the Board of Equalization meets to adjust rates because of federal tax changes and it limited them to making adjustments in the Nebraska rates to compensate only for the rate change at the federal level. And as I understand it, the loss of revenue to the State for the rate change to occur July 1 of 10 percent only is about \$37 million but the actual loss of revenue because of other substantive changes in the federal law would be about \$42 million. Or if, if the bill was enacted with Section 1 in it, it would result in an additional \$5 million loss of receipts over and above whatever receipts are lost because of freezing the corporate tax. How do you like that, Senator Newell?

SENATOR NEWELL: Well, Mr. President and members of the Legislature...