

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

March 30, 2004 LB 1089

taking home 24 percent less every week. The situation improved a month later, and by November of '03, we see that they are earning \$15.18, and that they are picking up on hours. And so they have come back up. But they're still 16 percent under where they were a year ago in the 2002 figures. In the leisure and hospitality fields, you see there very low-income people and how they're struggling. And you see that in fact in November of '02, in the food division they were making \$7.06 an hour, and November of '03, they're only making \$6.86. It isn't a large dollar difference, but it means that these people are out trying to find second jobs, maybe third jobs, and they're putting everyone in the household out in the work force, trying to make ends meet. Drinking places, you see there that while there was an 8 percent increase in the hourly wage from November '02 to October of '03, that in fact the take-home pay only increased by \$1.26 in a week. Those are the numbers that I'm looking at. I'm not just looking at our budget and how difficult it is for our agencies. I'm looking at the people of this state and saying, how are they making it, and what have we had to...what have we done to increase their burden? Because in fact, in the last two years, we have increased taxes. Last year, between the income and the sales tax, the taxes on other entities, and the property taxes that increased across the state, we increased the tax burden on our citizens by over \$.5 billion dollars. But this page tells you the story, that our folks don't have \$.5 billion more in their pockets. And so as we look at the state budget, we have to ask ourselves whether in fact we can, in this economic downturn, fund more growth. Now I also have a handout that I had prepared initially for the first amendment, which we have pulled because we wanted to clarify some things and make sure that Fiscal Office went through and corrected everything. But in those numbers you can see that in 2003-2004 what the requirement was. And the Governor actually had \$814,000 in his office. The committee amendment gave him a raise to \$848,000, even though he only asked for \$835,000. Now, I think that's because they were trying to be fair to all the agencies, and use the same percentage across the board. But if you go down the list, you will see that in the Governor's recommendation, half of these agencies still saw an increase, with his proposal, over the previous year. So there are significant numbers. I hope we have a long discussion, because