

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

March 18, 2004 LB 1089

that we're doing has impact over the next three years.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. You've heard the opening on AM3033. We're now open for discussion on that amendment. Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Hartnett, Senator Dwite Pedersen, Senator Chambers, Senator Wehrbein, Senator Raikes. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I just wanted to indicate to you briefly a couple of the things that we grappled with. In fact, what I really wanted to do was to set out for you, as best I could, the two big ideas in this bill. And I think that your opinion about this budget will be settled pretty much by the conclusions you come to with regard to these two big ideas. Everything else, relatively speaking, is small potatoes. The first idea is this, that is that we cut state aid to education by \$100 million in order to make the out years work; \$100 million. And then to mitigate that effect, we ease the school tax levy from \$1.05 to \$1.10. That amount of money is roughly enough to balance the budget in the out years if there is no disposal site judgement to pay. I didn't vote for this particular item in committee because I felt that we were doing two things that I didn't want to do in some proportion. We're cutting off money to K-12 education in the event that local levies are not increased to make up that amount. Or we're increasing property taxes if the levies are, in fact, increased to make up that amount. In other words, we are basically balancing this budget on education and on property taxpayers. And we are putting more pressure, especially on farmers and those who live on a fixed income, the elderly. And we are significantly reversing 25 years of work in this Legislature to lighten the property tax load. It is the easiest political course for us, and I think that's what will be difficult for us to deal with. Because we can say with a straight face that we cut spending, but then we do shift the political focus to school boards all across the state, especially those who choose to increase their levies and, thereby, increase property taxes. But the Appropriations Committee put a second big idea into play, and that is the idea of a temporary sales-income or utility sales tax which would raise \$112 million. I say