

February 5, 1982

LB 454

I submit that these proposals are completely different. In this amendment we are doing at least two things. One, the Legislature is taking the responsibility for setting the income tax rate and that responsibility has historically been with the State Board of Equalization. I prefer to leave it with that board. It is merely a mechanical function which that board carries out after this body decides how much money shall be spent. I think that is a proper way to do it. The other objection I have to the amendment is it is fixed. It says 16% period. Who knows at this point whether 16% is the proper amount? Maybe it should be 17%. Maybe it should be, if 454 passes, maybe it should be 16½%. Maybe it should be 15½%. I think this is far too inflexible. Another point, the public hearing on the bill, this can be handled without attaching the amendment to this bill and then sending this bill back to committee. The committee can propose a bill and hold a public hearing on this very same issue without holding up this bill. I think that would be the proper way to do it if it is the desire of this body to set this rate at a fixed percentage which I also believe is a mistake. Thank you.