

September 29, 1992 LB 4

that for 1991 and 1992 approximately 450 people, each year, will take advantage of that, for a total of, those two years, the tune of \$14.72 million. Now those are real cuts. Here's a program that we can cut, but we only have to look at approximately 450 people a year. And these are not the poorest of the poor, these are not individuals that are on the welfare roles. These are not the retarded and the mentally disabled, these are individuals who have extreme amounts of income. They are extremely wealthy. They are the wealthiest of the wealthiest in Nebraska, and they receive a welfare benefit in LB 775, under the capital gains provision, that amounts to \$7.2...\$7.4 million this year and next, each and every year. And we continue to endorse that as a body, but yet we are going to delay the ability for individuals who have a disability, as Senator Wesely very clearly pointed out, through no fault of their own, the opportunity to enter into the work world, to have the ability to no longer be on the public dole, to collect a check, pay their taxes, have some personal dignity, and to not have to constantly rely on others. All I ask is that we trade one welfare program for another, that we shift away from allowing the rich to be richer, to allow these disabled individuals in this case, under LB 4, to have a little bit of dignity, to allow for their program to kick into place and not be delayed. That's all the amendment does. It takes LB 4 off the table and it says that we're going to strike the capital gains provision that's allowed under 775, that is really nothing more than corporate welfare, that's all it is. It's welfare for the rich. We look at welfare as a derogatory term, we look at tax incentives or tax credits as a very popular, very positive term. It's all welfare, ladies and gentlemen, it's all welfare. We just don't like to put the term welfare to those 450 people that happen to fall in the very richest of the rich in the State of Nebraska, and we continue to attack those disabled, those that are in the most need of our help, and in this case it's worse than cutting the program. And I appreciate all the hard work that the committee had to go through, it's a very difficult situation to be in. There are others to blame, I guess, for why our plate is so limited in terms of what we have to choose from. But we would be better off cutting the program altogether than to continue to dangle the opportunity out there in front of these people and have the string get shorter and shorter and their ability to reach it be less and less as we delay, and delay, and delay, and as they age, and they age, and they age, and those programs that they have gone through, learn their skills, get farther and farther away from the time and point