

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

May 13, 2003

LB 402, 759

recently. The other one covers the additional unanticipated costs related to a recent employee retirement for the Electrical Board, and that is an additional \$27,046 of Cash Funds for 2002-2003 only also. These are added to the deficit bill. Once again, it's not unusual to have these coming along at a later date after we close a budget, and I am offering these as amendments to get us up to, in this case, termination of the Rural Development Commission, which will now be gone, and the Electrical Board, which is Cash Funds for an unanticipated employee retirement. I'd urge your adoption of this amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. You've heard the opening on AM1749 to LB 402. Open for discussion on that amendment offered by Senator Wehrbein. Senator Preister, followed by Senator Landis. Senator Preister. Is Senator... Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I referred the other day to show and tell on the revenue day, and this will be show and tell day on appropriations. We have gotten some greater clarity on revenue issues. Generally speaking, if I had to put them in a list, the body is of a mind to extend LB 1085. The bill moved well. The body seems to have a mind not to tax the repair of passenger cars with respect to a concern for the low income. There's a minority, but a strong and vocal minority, to raise the liquor tax from where it is. Right now there exists a majority to leave it where it is, but that seems to be in flux. The income tax moved. I think it moved rather tentatively. And then there's a desire, I think, to find a package, LB 759, that will take as many of those pieces and to meet the shortfall as best we can. And I think it would include LB 759, probably with an amendment on repairs. My guess is that since Senator Brashear is the introducer of that bill and not me, he may be of a mind to make a compromise on liquor, which I am not prepared to make, and my guess is that you're going to have to use the income tax as a balancing budget measure ultimately to get there if you solve for X. And what is X? X is how much money we need. X is the shortfall. The body has been sending messages, I think, that the revenue package is too large in some cases or it doesn't meet exactly what the body wants, and yet we have not been clear about what the body