

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

April 29, 2003

LB 407

this stuff. It's easy when you're not looking them in the eye. But when you're looking them in the eye and say, you going to cut. I'm going to say one more word, just this word here. Make sure, if we cut, how much we want to shift. I guess that was more than a word. I'm sorry. I'm sitting down.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I'm going to support the Revenue Committee at the current time. I think we are heading for a train wreck. But I thought I would do my best to explain what my own intentions are with respect to revenue. I'm going to ask the Revenue Committee to consider reporting out an extension of LB 1085. I'm going to ask them at the same time to consider doing statutorily what the Appropriations Committee has already done, which is they've transferred some money out of the Highway Trust Fund. If we cap at 5 cents the sales of cars, like we've done in this last round, and continue that, we would leave our tax level where it is today and raise about \$250 million. I want to do that bill in one place because I think it has one logical characteristic, which is the continuation of previously made revenue decisions. I also think that on the best day it might be possible to prevail upon the body to pass it. And with that characteristic, I certainly intend to go to the Governor and ask him to consider signing such a bill, on the argument that it would not be a tax increase; it would be a continuation of existing tax policies, and to acknowledge that. So I would...my purpose there is to keep a bill that might be able to be done with 25 votes, depending on how things break in the future. I don't know. Secondly, there are a couple of issues that require E clauses, so they can't get mixed up with everybody else. The liquor tax requires the E clause because it's set for July. Now, if you put that off to October, you lose a million bucks. But the industry has already agreed to July. In fact, they like July better, which means we need 33 votes for it, for an industry that will do it. So that's an E clause bill. One of the problems is, right now, although the liquor tax is over in the Brashear bill, it's over with an October date, and we lose a million bucks that the industry is prepared to give us. Better that we do that separately in a different bill in which