

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

April 1, 2004

LB 1090

because the businesses are out there, because the people who are high-users, and they happen to be business, don't want to pay a lot of money to help with the problem. But if you wanted to get around that, you could cap that, which would, I think, make the Beutler idea more palatable and more valuable. It has significant virtues that we're overlooking. That leaves us with the income tax. The original Hartnett income tax was structured very well. It acknowledges what is true about Nebraska, and that is that we have an idiosyncratically progressive income tax that asks more of our well-to-do citizens than any state except for Minnesota in all of the Midwest, and it is idiosyncratically progressive. Now I happen to like that. But in fact, if there is capacity compared to other states, it's in the way that Senator Hartnett originally had his income tax. And I think it's a valuable piece of any solution. The sales tax, by the way, which I don't think is particularly good, because of the border bleeding problems, is the only tax that generally has widespread public acceptance, on their theory that you can choose to pay it or not in your consumption patterns. It's also done in small amounts, and people believe in it. Now there's an equity problem that Senator Chambers presents here. My guess is, if we do what we've always done, we'll wind up with some kind of half sales tax, half income tax, if we do anything this session. That's okay. That's all right, particularly if we use the Hartnett-structured income tax idea as it was first initiated. I think that's the better approach. That would be an acceptable outcome. It will be ahead of the public. The public, I think, really wants us to consider, why can't we settle this case and build a dump and not pay 150 million bucks? Or they want us to not spend 150 million bucks someplace in the other parts of the budget and pay for it. And we're not doing the first, and we can't do the latter, in my estimation. I will put these in my order of how I think they are to the good. And my first preference is actually to do a half cent sales tax that we now have in the General Fund, sent back to the road fund, at \$14 million a year, and treat that as debt service on bonds sufficient to do this. It doesn't reduce the road fund in any way, and it doesn't create a burden on the existing road fund. It actually creates that burden on the half cent that's now in the General Fund. It is a no-tax-increase solution that uses a one-time cost strung out over 30 years. That actually happens