

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

May 27, 2003

LB 283, 759

we went through in the 2001, 2002, 2003 Sessions, the cuts we made and so on. We have that knowledge; it's going to leave. This new body that's elected in 2006, the 20 whatever it is senators that come in then, don't have that luxury of saying we've worked our way through this. And I think there's way too much comfort in them coming in and saying we have the tax rate set at 5.5 percent, we don't have to do this or examine that. I think we need to apply that pressure to them of pain, if that's what you want to call it. There would be way too much mischief involved if they simply just rode into town and had this in front of them and these extra millions of dollars to reinstitute things. They have not gone through the process we have this session or prior sessions getting where we are and working our way through this. That's why I think it's good policy. And it's not politics to me. It's policy we're talking about here to have them examine what they have to do in 2007 to keep the budget in line and not automatically reinstate some of the tough cuts that we have made. Simply saying here's the money, do with it as you please, they don't have that background, institutional knowledge, that we've developed over the years here. I want to clarify something too that was brought up before by Senator Kremer. The Highway Trust Fund money, if we don't sunset the half-cent sales tax that's going to the General Fund out of the Highway Trust Fund right now, it's been revised upward from \$22.1 million to \$26.8 million, actually is what the figure I have here, \$26.8 million. The difference in the \$5 million there roughly is the operative date of when that transfer begins. Originally, the fiscal note said it would begin January 1 of 2004. The bill, LB 759, the operative date is October 1 of 2003, and that's about \$5 million difference. So that's another \$5 million that's going to go from the Highway Trust Fund to the General Fund in LB 759. Back to the main debate though, whether this is good policy or not, I simply am going to repeat that I don't think we owe it to that new Legislature coming in in 2007 to have this luxury, this increased tax rate, just simply set in front of them. If it weren't for term limits I'd say fine. If they didn't exist, fine, we'd have that individual knowledge, the pain and the discussions we've had to get where we are today. I just think it would cause way too much mischief to say, here's the money, do as it what you please. I, for one, would like to hold them