

February 25, 1982

LB 304

LB 304 to Select for a specific amendment. And here again is the very same amendment that we had last week that does increase the income tax to 16 percent. And I think the information that you have been provided with heretofore plainly shows that regardless of whether we end up with the Governor's budget or whether we are slightly more, that it is going to be a necessity that 16 percent be in the individual income tax rate. It is part of the Revenue Committee's recommendation again, and I am not going to take any more time. We went through all that last week, but the reasoning is still the same and I would urge your support for the return of this bill for this specific amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Just briefly, Mr. President, and again as Senator Carsten has indicated this is consistent with the program the Revenue Committee has outlined. It will be consistent with the amendment for the resolution that will be taken up later this morning for a spending target figure, and I think it is exceedingly clear as it has been probably for some time that the state cannot absorb both the reduced receipts because of the weakness of the economy as well as the more artificial reduction because of the change in the federal tax base in which we piggyback. I think that this will at least meet minimum needs of the state and I think it places the issue fairly before us, and I would hope the amendment would be adopted.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would just like to reiterate one more time why I am opposed to this amendment, and I haven't seen it.... is that in the Journal or is it on our desks? In our heads. Okay. If I understand it correctly, it is just set the income tax rate at not less than 16 percent. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: Senator, the....shall not be less than 16 percent, right.

SENATOR LAMB: Okay. I think as you remember, I voted for the proposal that was presented in the Special Session which would have in effect forced a 16 percent rate because some of the cash funds would not have been lapsed. I thought that was an appropriate way to go and I am still comfortable with that decision. However, my problem with these proposals similar to the one that we have before