

January 23, 1980

LB 44

are raising revenues. We are collecting revenues from the sales tax on food but we said we are aiming, this legislative body has said that we are aiming to reimburse the average family income for their cost. \$26, woefully inadequate. In fact the Governor of the state asked Don Leuenberger of his office to come in, and I asked at the hearing, at the Revenue hearing on Monday, and I asked Don, I said, Don, excuse me, yes, on Monday. I said, Don, how did you come up with \$26 and Don Leuenberger said, well, we looked at how much money we had left, how much money we had to spend and we determined that \$26, we could afford \$26 because that is how much money we had. I said you mean it is not a philosophical approach looking at the average income and he said, no, it is a budgetary approach. How much money we've got, that is how much we can do. Now Senator Keyes will probably get up and talk about money that we have in the general fund that we could be spending but I am saying this, if we are going to make this credit system work, we have to use adequate figures and \$30 is not going to be, is not even going to be adequate. \$26 is woefully inadequate, and for that reason, we have to increase from the \$26 credit to a \$30 credit to try to replace again only the average family income in the State of Nebraska. We are not going to reimburse the wealthy who spend more than that but only the average because that is what we philosophically said we were about in this tax credit from the very beginning. Now it is easy for this Legislature to make budgetary decisions. We don't have the money so we are not going to increase the credit. We want to spend the money on something else so we are not going to increase the credit. Or that money would look good as a 6.5% overlevy so we are not going to increase the credit. You know, all these things are the justifications that we have used in the past not to keep this credit system up. Now we opted not to eliminate the sales tax on food. We have opted to use the credit system and I heard such raves and great accolades towards this whole credit system, and if there is that much support for the credit system, let's at least make it adequate. Let's at least keep to our social purpose, to our financial purpose. Let's not make budgetary decisions based on how much we want to spend. Let's try to keep it where we said we were going to keep it at the middle, median, average income and the cost that those people, those unseen people who are in that category, would receive full credit. \$30 is inadequate. It has to be more than that, \$31, \$32, but \$30 at least gets us to where we ought to be today, not where we should be tomorrow, I mean, next year when this actually takes place but where we are at today. For that, I submit that this amendment is

6306