

February 15, 1996 LB 1050

rationale, I thought, for going to \$83.3 million. I thought the rationale was that that would have been the original amount collected under 1059 in the first year it was fully...

SENATOR BOHLKE: Correct.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: ...in the first year it was fully implemented.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Correct, right. But what we created...

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Okay, so what...

SENATOR BOHLKE: ...is a gap.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: No, I..., Senator Bohlke, my understanding, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but my understanding is that you were attempting to freeze the rebate at the amount that would have been distributed in the first year that 1059 was fully implemented.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Correct.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Good. Then you have the wrong number, because the first year that 1059...

SENATOR BOHLKE: Now you're...now you're...now you're pushing it. (Laughter)

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Okay. The first year, the first year that 1059 was fully implemented, the first year that 1059 was fully implemented about \$102 million was distributed as rebate. And that happened, Senator Bohlke, because, because 1059 was phased in. The first year the tax rates did not go to the full tax rates called for in 1059, they were phased in. And then it took two years for us to catch up. So the first year that the income tax rebate was distributed with the full effect of 1059 in place was actually '92-93, and the amount that was distributed was \$102.3 million. It is easy to understand why those kinds of things can happen, the difference between 83 million and 102 million. But if we're going to be consistent about what we're trying to do I think we ought to be...if...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.