

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

May 5, 2005

LB 425

here, that would be willing to let MIRF expire when the time comes and state aid to cities. By the way, state aid to cities, counties, and so forth, the history of that is it replaced personal property tax back in the seventies. It was not necessarily an account, a genius that restored it. It was the amount of money that was lost to cities and counties and the NRDs, what they were getting from the personal property, and it's interesting how we lose sight of that in history. But that was the original intent, to replace personal property taxes. So I'm going to oppose Senator Mines because that, to my best memory with the aid of the transcript and the study, I think we intended to...the restoration was intended, it was done via MIRF, and you'll...that does show \$3 million. But I don't think it was our intent at that time also then to restore another \$3 million in state aid to cities. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. On with discussion, Senator Kremer, followed by Senator Kruse.

SENATOR KREMER: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. I was one of, I think, five that voted against this bill in '03, and I was also one of the "Dirty 30" that raised our sales tax and income tax somewhat. The reason I voted against it was because it was just a shift, and I remember telling people as I went back home to town hall meetings as we were a lot of times saying, we cut, we cut, we cut, and we didn't raise taxes near as much as we cut. But I think we shifted, shifted, shifted, is what we really did, and that's what was happening here. We cut the cities, aid to cities, and really it had to go back on property taxes. It was only a shift; people still had to pay it. I guess I have some questions for Senator Pederson if he would answer them. And what you're doing now is reinstating MIRF and cutting the like amount from the state aid to the cities. Could you tell me why that...and I'll just...let me have a couple of other comments first. This kind of puts a burden on the cities that have some flexibility when the state aid just goes into their General Fund. They can use it for infrastructure, they can use for anything else. If one year they use it a lot more for streets, another...if it goes back into MIRF, then they're restricted on what they can use it for, and puts less flexibility in the money, but it would be the same