

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

May 19, 2003

LB 596

five-year period for recovering the add-back, would it be possible to make that add-back time no longer than the...?

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: (Microphone malfunction)...come to mind. We're on General File, not Select File. So we've got a little bit of time. And that question, I think, can be asked of Revenue. However, my initial reaction is, you can't do that without surrendering some revenue, without giving up some revenue, in my estimation. But we're on General File. And if that...if you want to pursue that, Senator Raikes, there may be a time to do that. Ideally, from my perspective, if we were to pursue that, it should not be at the loss of revenue to the state. That's going to be my guiding principle in deciding whether changes are needed here. And my guess is, Senator Beutler may have wanted some of his time back.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Senator Landis. And thank you, Senator Beutler.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Beutler, you have three minutes and twenty seconds.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I did want some of my time back. But Senator Landis doesn't escape, in any event. One question, Senator Landis. I just want to understand conceptually. You indicated that at least for the biennium that we're in, that all of the possible ripple effects that we could anticipate are being addressed, so that there would be no revenue loss in the biennium, to the best of our ability to preclude that. Is that...that's accurate so far, right?

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: That's a fair characterization. Something would have to come along that's not now contemplated in either the House or the Senate bills, that would be injected into the process, pass both houses, and for which nobody here, nobody that we know of, is now doing. In other words, the three pieces of the federal law that are the subject of those two versions