

April 17, 1973

(Start Belt #7)

two and a half to two. What he has said is that if we use that revenue sharing money, we can then reduce the State sales tax from 2½ to 2%. That, however, is a decision for this body to make. We have not made it yet. Frankly, I don't think that is the recommendation of the Governor because if you go back further in this--to the--toward the front of his speech, he says, my recommendations to you this year were for \$18,000,000, this is capital improvement that he's talking about so he did not tell us that he was going to be able to reduce the sales tax from 2½ to 2. All he said was that if you want to use \$20,000,000 worth of revenue sharing, then you can reduce from 2½ to 2. All he has said is that if we stick with his budget, he can reduce the income tax from 15 to 10. As far as 256 is concerned, that's the capital improvements budget. I think myself that we should follow the Governor's recommendation and that, LB 256 is his bill in which he recommended approximately 18 (million ?) dollars worth of capital improvements as far as the buildings and that type of thing that are--that they cover. Now I would recommend, for example, that we follow the Budget Committee's capital improvement budget, whatever their recommendations are as far as that particular bill is concerned. Let's bring it out in the best form that they can put it in and pass it. I want to be sure that the body clears up the one thing that we seem to be mistaken on and that is the fact that the Governor is supposed to have said that he would reduce the sales tax from 2½ to 2. He said in essence, he would--he did not say he'd do that. He said he would do that if we use revenue sharing for that purpose. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Next to speak is Senator Gary Anderson.

SENATOR ANDERSON: Mr. President and Members of the body. All through the day yesterday I found myself hoping that I would wake up this morning and find that the whole day was a bad dream and that it really hadn't happened after all, but nevertheless, that is not true and I think perhaps the action yesterday has, has had some merit. It has stated in a very dramatic way that the people of Nebraska are desirous of some serious spending cuts. They are desirous of us saying no to additional expenses, but I think our normal procedures, our normal way of doing business here provides a perfectly adequate means of saying no in terms of the regular procedure and I think that all of us are adults and fully capable of doing this and I think that we could have gone on without the action yesterday and accomplished exactly the same thing. The action yesterday also said in a very dramatic way that many of the members of this Legislature think that there are serious deficiencies in the Governor's budget, but again I think that we have a set of procedures by which we can evaluate the deficiencies of the budget and I am very disappointed that we didn't attempt to do this. The action really, I think in a way, was a giant poker game in which the Legislature was attempting to call the Governor's bluff. The Legislature was gambling that the Governor's budget was wrong but I think the unfortunate thing about this is that it has to be the people of Nebraska, the people who are supposedly being served by the myriad of bills that are still left on the board right now that are going to have to pay the stakes in this game. I don't think that we are acting at all in a responsible way if we ask the people of Nebraska to pay these stakes without asking questions individually about each of these issues. The responsible way for us to act is not to gamble with the people of the State of Nebraska paying the stakes, not to gamble that the Governor's budget is not going to work, I think the responsible action that we should have taken and we still have this opportunity to take