

March 26, 1980

LB 1002

PRESIDENT: The question is, shall the Chair be overruled. If you vote aye, you are voting to overrule the Chair. If you vote no, you are sustaining the Chair. So the question is, shall the Chair be overruled. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. It takes 23 votes. I will tell you that right now. 23 according to who is here today. It is a majority of those present, yes, so it is 23. Do you want to have a Call of the House on this?

SENATOR LAMB: No, let it go.

PRESIDENT: All right, record the vote.

CLERK: 19 ayes, 21 nays to overrule the Chair, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Motion fails. The Chair has been sustained and, Senator Warner, you will close on the amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I can appreciate that everybody wants and properly so, understand exactly what the effect of the amendment is. First, I want to say, I have not said, the committee did not say that there was \$32,000,000 available. What we did say that up to \$30,000,000. Now my personal opinion and that is all it is, that the real figure if any, that is more likely to be, under the concept here, it is more likely to be in the vicinity of \$20 or \$25,000,000. The concept is that additional state aid for property tax relief can be accomplished through this amendment without an increase in sales-income tax rates. That is the concept. That you are returning any excess, any collections above the estimates, again because of inflation, back to the public in the form of a reduced taxes, either property or if there is no action of any kind, why I assume we would eventually have reduced income or sales tax, one or the other. I have also stated that I visited with the Attorney General and if the concept is accepted by the body then I would put that official writing as to whether or not it could be done and I would think that based on the comments that many of you have made that the need for some property tax relief certainly seems to have broad support and the real option that you are making here, in my opinion, is that if you do not choose this but you support property tax relief and you support increased sales-income tax to accomplish it, then a much higher level could be put in. This is only a concept of returning those funds collected back in the form of property tax relief as an alternative to sales-income tax reduction. I think it is a very sound approach. The concept is, as I have indicated, is identical to what has been utilized by more than one state and I think that as a matter of public policy it is a proper