

May 5, 1981

LB 257

majority of this body saw fit not to raise the severance tax to that degree and Senator Remmers was one of the leaders opposing that increase in the severance tax which I felt was more than justified. So as a result we found that we could not, in fact, do as Senator Remmers wanted to do and that was to leave the 2% go into the permanent school fund and then the additional monies go into the different energy programs that we identified. We simply could not have the resources we needed to do that so we did decide to take for a five year period only the total 3% severance tax and use that money to weatherize schools and also use a very small amount of that money to subsidize some energy programs in the energy office and the solar office. The feeling was that those were very good programs that needed to be helped. I guess a couple, three hundred thousand is all that we are using to support those. The rest of the money would go back to the schools to weatherize their buildings. Now if Senator Remmers would have included in his motion an attempt to raise the severance tax to 4% and allowed 2% to go to the programs that we have identified and weatherization and otherwise and left the other 2% to go to permanent school fund well then perhaps that would have been agreeable. But what he is proposing to do here is basically gut the bill because we just simply cannot afford to do the different things that we want to do simply with the 1% extra tax that we increased through this bill. So I guess there is just not a way in which to do what he wants to do without some other changes and so I would say that we have compromised down. We have got the oil industry in support of the severance tax increase that is in the bill. We have talked to the Nebraska School Boards Association. They have not taken a formal position but I know Justin King and I have talked several times and he has indicated that this is a wise use of the money that we are raising through the severance tax and for a five year period it seems to him and to myself and to others that this is going to go to a good purpose in weatherizing our schools and the investment we make in our schools through this method will return more to the State of Nebraska than we could have otherwise achieved through the permanent school fund and through the equalization formula that Senator Remmers talks about. Clearly we have seen that investments and conservation are very cost efficient and pay for themselves in a matter of a year or two and beyond that there are savings to the taxpayers because after that initial capital investment it is going to be lower taxes that we are going to have to be paying to support our utility bills through our school systems so it seems to me a very wise investment. It seems to me that Senator Remmers could have come up with something like this through a severance tax increase but hasn't and so I think we are at a point where we simply