

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

May 27, 2003

LB 283

doing well, you recoup the expenses made by government. And by that means you try to even out the economic cycles and provide for a more generally congenial and soft economic cycle. Now at the federal level there's a raging debate all the time as to whether you positively influence the economy at this particular point in time by increasing expenditures, which tends to be favored by Democrats, or by cutting tax rates, which tends to be favored by Republicans. As a factual matter, right now at the federal level they're doing both, of course. They're doing incredible deficit spending and at the same time they're cutting tax rates. So at the state level, of course, we are very much handcuffed in participating in this kind of tax policy, however good it may be and however supported it may be by the economists generally, because we have to balance our budget and so we are limited in what we can do. But, having said this, \$108 million has come down from the federal government to stimulate the economy. Earlier on, before we knew this money would be coming down and in what amount and under what circumstances, a general provision was put in the appropriations bill that said all of this money will go into the Cash Reserve Fund, which would build our Cash Reserve Fund from \$117 million to about \$225 million. So if you do nothing today and nothing more on this subject, that's what will happen. The Cash Fund will build up to the low-level nuclear waste level of 160 and it will go way beyond that to \$225 million. And when you put it in a Cash Reserve Fund, of course, it doesn't...it just stays there. It's just invested. It doesn't stimulate the economy in any way, which is the purpose of this money. So I wanted to present to you two alternatives that could be, I think, rightly interpreted as being in line with the federal policy to stimulate the economy. The first amendment, the one that's in front of you right now, is an expenditure side recommendation, if you wanted to do it that way. It basically, to oversimplifies (sic), undoes, in exactly the same way that we did it, the \$30 million additional cut to the education system, both higher and lower education, that we did several weeks ago. So we would simply back that out, take \$60 million that...of federal money, put that in the General Fund, and then we would have additional provisions in other bills that we would reappropriate that money to the university, to the state colleges, to the community colleges, and to K-12 education in exactly the same proportions and almost