

March 29, 1982

LB 693

SENATOR CARSTEN: Yes, Senator Newell, that is correct. As you said, it was that not wanting to increase the sales tax unless it just had to be because of the other but you are absolutely correct.

SENATOR NEWELL: Now further for the record, it is the intent here to continue the 50-50 tie or at least the provisions of the law which require the income tax to raise more money than the sales tax. Could you say that for the record again, Cal. I hate to get you up again.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Yes, Senator Newell, that is correct. It is my understanding and I think you and I talked to Mr. Leuenberger both of us this morning and that is true. It is the intent that the income tax still would be expected to raise more than...not less than the sales tax.

SENATOR NEWELL: Okay, now I am going to further clarify my understanding of the intent of this amendment and that is simply that because of the difficulties that can exist for retailers and everyone else in terms of changing to the new one-quarter percent increase in the sales tax, this amendment is intended to try to lessen the necessity to do that so that it is in the intent or was the reason explained to Senator Carsten and myself, the intent is that the income tax would be increased if there is, you know, a necessary change and that this provision is not to create an automatic increase in the sales tax just to require the meeting of the 50-50 provisions. Now I think it probably could be written a little tighter but that is the legislative intent and for that reason I support the amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR VARD JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I am just going to have a little colloquy with Senator Carsten. Senator Carsten, don't you think this amendment may be a hair miswritten? If I can find my page again, it is on, what, 1362? 1369.

SENATOR CLARK: 1369.

SENATOR VARD JOHNSON: Okay. It says "except when a change in the sales and use tax rate or individual income tax rate would be required solely to meet the provisions of this subsection". Now that is subsection (1). Now I think that this little change we are making with LB 693 is in subsection (2), so shouldn't this...if this amendment is to do as you describe it, Senator Carsten, shouldn't it read "except when a change in the sales and use tax rate or individual income tax rate would be required solely to meet the provisions of subsection (2)"?