

April 3, 1992

LB 719A, 829

SENATOR CROSBY: They won't pay 43?

SENATOR LANDIS: They will pay \$30 as a result of this amendment. They have a...

SENATOR CROSBY: But they still have to pay...

SENATOR LANDIS: ...continuing obligation to pay \$13...

SENATOR CROSBY: Okay, so...

SENATOR LANDIS: ...which is now in the statute, that's right.

SENATOR CROSBY: ...so it's another \$30.

SENATOR LANDIS: They will write a check for 43, 13 of which they'll write if this amendment does not pass.

SENATOR CROSBY: Okay, thank you. Well, I still think I may not vote for it and I understand what you're trying to do and I understand what Senator Warner said, but a year ago after LB 829 and some of the results of that I just thought I was never going to do that again to certain businesses. So, before we come to a vote, I will try to make a good decision but I don't think I will vote for it. Thank you.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator Crosby. Senator Hall, you're next.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Conway, members, I rise to oppose the amendment but I think, Senator Crosby, the issue that you raise about...and it's not for purposes of the fact that it raises additional monies because it doesn't. It isn't honest in its approach in terms of raising it on into the future. It has a sunset that is laid out as a cash flow problem and I don't believe that that issue has been explained well enough. I don't believe that it is justified. I think what we have here is a short-term fix that gets us through the next budget cycle and we'll worry about it next year, is how it could very easily have been portrayed as well. Senator Crosby, I think the concern that you raise is really not that valid of a one. I mean, some of these businesses that you speak of have been paying personal property tax prior to this. That, unless they're depreciating that property, goes away, and the \$30, in the example that you gave, I don't think is too much to ask of any business, no