

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 6, 2003

LB 285

as we look forward now, we need to keep in place. There is, as she mentioned I think, always the concern that if you raise a tax then the Legislature will never reconsider it or never, at a later time, decide to undo the increase, and that certainly isn't borne out by experience. I was here in 1997, when the income tax rate was lowered. We also lowered at that time the sales tax rate. I think there is plenty of energy to move toward lower rates, as Senator Landis says, when it is clearly indicated that it can be done in a fiscally prudent manner. So with that, I will simply suggest...the other point I'll make quickly is that I think if you look at the spending proposals and the projections we now have, it makes sense to me that the Legislature that deals with the spending issues at the time, much as we're dealing with the ones we have right now, ought to be able to take credit for, if you will, reducing tax rates if, in fact, they can deal with the spending issues that they face. I think that spending increases are a definite focus, not only of the public but of the Legislature. I think there are a strong force to keep the Legislature responsible so I'm not worried about that. I think that the responsible thing to do at this point is to continue the revenue increase that is proposed here for the indefinite future and then certainly keep the option open of lowering it whenever that becomes a real possibility. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Beutler, on AM1739.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, I would also like to oppose the amendment. Senator Raikes has gone over the fact that the out years of the biennium indicate an \$800 million plus problem, and Senator Redfield has brought that to our attention also. So we know we have a four-year problem. We don't just have a two-year problem. But the point I wanted to emphasize is what I think happened when we reduced the income tax in 1996. At that particular point in time, the main agenda of the Legislature was to lower property taxes, to put levy limits on all the political subdivisions, and to do a variety of things that started to get a handle on and control property taxes. That was our main agenda and we thought we could do that and cut the income tax at the same time, but we were wrong. As it turned out, this