

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

May 6, 2003

LB 285, 759

we was trying to make more cuts and trying to get by that way. But now that LB 1085 is a year old now and we're talking about extending it with LB 285, I'm going to vote to support this. I think this is the right way to go now. We got the half-cent sales tax in there bringing in \$180 million, and income tax \$30-35 million, and cigarette tax around \$30 million. And you don't know just which way to go. We do have a lot of bills out there to make the decision, and I think we've got enough bills out there to make the decision and come up with something that we can all put things all together. But preferably, I would go with the LB 285 and if we have to put something more with it I would rather go that route than with the LB 759. There's some problems in it that I don't know whether we can get worked out, and we got another bill on sales tax on repairs and on the labor part of it, and I will not support that. But I want to support this and I think we ought to keep it alive and keep it going, and I think this is probably the way we're going to have to go to raise enough income to at least come close to balancing the budget. I know everybody says, well, got to make more cuts. Well, there's only...there's four major ways in the budget bill that you can cut, and that's the university and K-12 and prisons and then one other one in there, that that's...them four major ones is the only ones that we can actually cut because that's the four big ones. So we got to consider that too as we're thinking about doing something with the budget yet. But I'm going to support this one and see how we come out on it. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Jones. Senator Raikes, on the Redfield amendment.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I'm going to oppose the Redfield amendment and support the Revenue Committee's work. Senator Redfield introduction mentioned that the committee amendment was honest. I think she's correct. I think it was also responsible. If you look at the second page on your agenda and look at the out biennium, you see a minus nearly \$800 million. There is no indication there that it would be responsible to end a revenue stream after the 2004-2005 Fiscal Year. In fact, clearly the opposite is suggested. This is a revenue stream that, at least