

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

May 6, 2003

LB 379

translated into further crippling higher education and/or increasing local property taxes. So to some extent, this is a choice between income taxes and property taxes. Neither one of them are tasteful, but I think my choice, at least at this point, is I at least want to keep income tax as a potential tool for a solution. The other thing I would mention, and I don't see Senator Jensen here, but I noticed he comes out on the other side of this bill. I would suggest that one of the things, as this gets to Select File, one of the...one thing I would like to do is to offer an amendment that would allow a credit for long-term care insurance to go along with this additional increase in...or this increase in the income tax rate back to the 1996 level. I think there are a couple of important things to be gained by that. One of them is that some of the higher income folks that supposedly would be hit by this would have some relief in the form of a deduction or credit for a long-term care policy. The second thing is long-term care, nursing home care, is one of the very important issues we face in spending in this state. Medicaid expenses have risen dramatically, continue to rise dramatically. One very important part of that is long-term care. More than half of the patients in long-term care nursing homes in the state are Medicaid patients. And I think at least part of that is because we have not sufficiently made it clear to people that they need to provide for their own long-term care situations. So that is something that I would very much like to associate with this, but with or without that, I'm going to support it. Thank you.

**SPEAKER BROMM:** Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Redfield.

**SENATOR REDFIELD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. Earlier today, Senator Jim Jensen passed around a chart which I was also was going to send, but we'll save paper. It looks like this and it was a survey that was done by Voices for Children, and it talks about voters expressing their preference for the types of tax increases. And if you look at it, the one that they said no on, 74 percent of them, is income taxes. Now why is that? Well, I'll tell you why. Because it is not flexible. It is not flexible at all for the majority of Nebraskans. It is flexible for those at the very top tier. In fact, there are a number of vehicles that they can put their money in which will