

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

March 22, 2004      LB 1093

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Schimek, I would respectfully submit that this is not about the children on this round of debate. I think we all have in our minds that one way or another we're going to protect the children. Either we'll protect the children by restoring some of the 100 thousand...\$100 million of state aid that we cut to the children or we'll protect the children by raising the property tax levy so they're protected by that manner. This is not a question at this stage in debate about protecting the children. This is a question about which form of taxation or combination thereof we want to have. Does the committee amendment solve the problem? Of course not. That's the whole question. We want to leave it at \$1.05 so that we start from the premise on Select File that we're not going to use property taxes as the tax...as the preferred tax of solution. If you reject the reconsideration and reject...and adopt the committee amendments, then you can start out on Select File with a variety of alternatives, all of which can be designed to cover whatever gap you have. Even Senator Chambers' income tax can be varied, manipulated, modified to cover whatever gap that's there. The gap that should be covered if we leave it at \$1.05 would be the \$100 million gap. Some of you may want to consider a sales tax. That can be fashioned for whatever dollar amount you want to raise. Senator Brashear has offered us the solution of the highway bonds. That can be structured and fashioned to raise whatever amount of dollars you want to raise. I think it makes a lot of sense to consider solutions that take into account the low-level nuclear waste facility problem. I think we're making a mistake to risk \$50,000 a day interest starting in November or thereabouts. Nonetheless, everything is before you on Select File to be fashioned as you choose. Then if you come to the decision that you are unable or unwilling to fashion something that covers all of the gaps, then as a last resort, you can go back and raise the levy to \$1.07, \$1.08, \$1.09 or all the way back up to \$1.10, if you want to throw your hands up and rely upon the property tax to solve the problem. All those things are before you. The question is, what do you want to give the advantage to? And I suggest to you if you leave it at \$1.05, you will give the advantage to solutions other than reliance upon the property tax as the solution, and that's where, for myself, I would prefer to