

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

May 5, 2005

LB 425

of the broadening of the sales tax, not...it was not intended to cover the obligation for MIRF. And I think it's important to note that of 532 municipalities in Nebraska, only 160 have a local option sales tax. Now could every one have a sales tax? Absolutely. Citizens in every one of our villages and cities could vote in a local option sales tax up to 1.5 cents, but quite frankly in many of these cities 1.5 cents won't make much difference. They don't have the ability to capture much sales...enough sales tax to make a difference. And Senator Pederson had passed out some interesting information, and I can't dispute what it says. What I can dispute is...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR MINES: ...the information begins in fiscal year 2004-05, and it doesn't change through the rest of the graph. What it doesn't show is...or doesn't mention is fiscal years 2004-05 were the years that MIRF was cut by \$3 million. So of course it's not going to increase. According to this body's vote on the amendment of LB 440 two years ago, we were going to reinstate MIRF as it stood before, and this...if we go back to the fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003, MIRF was at \$3 million a year. These numbers should be \$14,770,000 as opposed to \$11,000 (sic). We're not honoring the commitment we made on this floor two years ago. That's the argument. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Mines. Senator Mines, your light is next. Do you wish to waive your opportunity? Senator Erdman. Senator Erdman, you're recognized.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, I'm going to rise in opposition to Senator Mines' amendment, and it has absolutely nothing to do with really what's in Senator Mines' amendment, because he says a deal is a deal, and I think we should somehow honor that. And if we're going to honor it in this area, I think we should probably honor it in other areas. I voted against Senator Byars' amendment, not because I thought it was bad public policy or that it wouldn't help in the situation that he spoke of, but it appears that the goal here is to try to rush to spend the money that we