

February 25, 1992 LB 1120

what...the sector analysis of the 3-R plan very well. We have some very educated guesses on what it might be.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR MOORE: At least the voters of the State of Nebraska can understand the status quo. My preference is to move LB 1120. I prefer to move with sales and income tax. You heard Senator Hall state, I don't fault him for what he is saying, he don't like to replace the revenue. But the key thing is, is let's move, if we don't want to adopt this amendment now, let's move LB 1120 and make it clear to the people of the State of Nebraska, we are not going backwards and putting things back on the tax roll, we are going to move forward and finally take all personal property tax off, and admit it doesn't work.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Is Senator Schmit anywhere? I do not see Senator Schmit. Anyone else wishing to discuss the amendment by Senator Hall? If not, Senator Hall, do you wish to close?

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. The amendment is one that does bring the issue to a head. It should be adopted to 1120. I do not like the provisions in the bill as they currently exist, and I don't think...I agree with the opponents of 1120 that a general sales and income tax increase will not be something that the voters of the state will tolerate nor should they. Our sales tax rate is as high as it needs to go. The one thing that you will hear out there when you talk to them is that there is too darn many exemptions. If there were more people paying the tax, you wouldn't have to be looking at an increase. And the second thing that Senator Warner loves to hear is about all the waste, fraud, and corruption in government that we need to cut out of that. Well, I agree with him. I can never nail him down on which waste, fraud, and corruption we are talking about, but I heard it again this morning on the radio while I was shaving. It was amazing that, you know, we need to save some money by getting rid of the 900 school districts that are out there, and some of that waste, fraud, and corruption in state government before we look at increasing taxes. I don't disagree, but I would sure like to see him point specifically to some things. But the case here before us right now is the issue of how do we sell a proposal that (a) doesn't impact local homeowners or residential taxpayers with regard to property tax, how do we get that revenue back into local people's hands