

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

April 8, 2002 LB 898, 1085

broadening that will generate, my recollection is, about \$21 million, all in all, it would add up to be more than we need to balance in the current biennium and more than what we would need to balance in the out biennium. Now, I have been assuming that what would happen was that we would see an amendment that would strike all of the other provisions in LB 1085 and substitute, for the mix of revenues that we have currently in LB 1085, a single two-year increase in the sales tax rate. Now, quite frankly, I don't think that's good policy for us. I don't think it will do what people expect in terms of making our fiscal house be in order and it is not a...that is not an alternative that I had any plans to support in any form. I think there were those who were hopeful that that as a resolution would be what we could do. It seemed to be simple. It seemed to be something that they could explain to their constituents and it would seem to work. Well, part of that was obviously I think not the case. It would not work. We wouldn't balance...now some people thought that if we did that we could also not pass LB 898, that is we would not have to reduce state aid if we simply did a half-cent sales tax for two years. That is not the case. If you adopted a half-cent sales tax for two years, you would still have to do LB 898 because, if you did not, you could not balance in the current biennium. And if you did not do LB 898, you would have a very substantial imbalance in the out years. By the calculations that have been prepared by my staff, we would be unbalanced in the current biennium of about \$13.5 million, and we would be unbalanced in the out year by \$168 million. So next January the Legislature would reconvene and immediately face a \$168 million deficit if all we did was a half-cent sales tax increase and did not then reduce state aid to schools. It doesn't work. Now, on a general policy point, I think it doesn't work either. I see no reason for us to try to balance the budget on a straight sales tax increase because the sales tax is regressive. It does hit the lowest-income individuals in Nebraska the hardest. And I will assert, until somebody can prove to me otherwise, that the budget cuts also hurt the very poorest in the state the most, because it is typically the poorest people in the state who rely the most on government services. At least that's my view of the world. If it's wrong...