

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

March 22, 2004 LB 1093

conservative people, I understand.

PRESIDENT HEINEMAN: Time has expired.

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you.

PRESIDENT HEINEMAN: Thank you, Senator Baker. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of the Legislature, I'm going to break from the Appropriations Committee on this issue, and I want to explain, as carefully as I can, why. When...when we dealt with this in the Appropriations Committee, we had an individual vote, first of all, as to whether to include this property tax piece that we're discussing right now, and it was heavily debated, all the arguments that you're going to hear in a few minutes. The vote was 5 to 3 to include it, so we had an internal struggle with the matter. But part of that discussion and part of the overall plan was a second piece that included the request to the Revenue Committee to produce \$122 million of additional revenue. Those were the two key foundation pieces. And then when this overall package came out of committee, I voted for it because I understood that both of those pieces would be a part of the package. What has subsequently happened is that the \$122 million in revenue that we were requesting from the Revenue Committee, both of these pieces required work from two other committees. The \$122 million revenue piece that we requested from the Revenue Committee was declined, but the Education Committee came forward with this \$100 million piece. But to me, those two issues are inextricably connected. Now, on the surface, you may say they're not connected because this \$100 million in state aid, that cut, does solve our immediate budget problem. The \$122 million that we asked the Revenue Committee to raise was, in part, for the low-level nuclear waste site disposal solution. You're saying, how are these things connected? Here's how they're connected, in my mind. If we raise the \$122 million of additional revenue, then we have that pot of money sitting there. If the \$104 million revenue forecast is wrong, as I believe it is, and maybe it's only half that amount, then we could reduce the property taxes next year using the \$122 million in revenue and assuming we don't need it