

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

March 30, 2004      LB 1089, 1090

would produce \$6 million. Take a million off of that for expense, we have our \$5 million. There you are. And there's a real plus to this one. It would fit with the law and order feeling that most of us on this floor have. It would increase future revenues by getting to a little bit of enforcement about some of our laws and regulations, which we are not enforcing. We have literally thousands of accounts that have some flag or suspect on them that we're not looking at. So if you would like to cut or find \$5 million, increase the budget there, we'll find the \$5 million, and we will not do some of the damages which we discovered in committee, and Senator Wehrbein will be speaking to that. We discovered some serious damages that could occur. It would be long-range damages. It's not this year that we're thinking about as much as the future years. So I urge the body to take some serious thought about this. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Kruse. Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Vrtiska and others.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, when we're in these kinds of times, the question of cutting budgets is, of course, entirely appropriate, and in almost every situation it makes sense and we have in fact cut the budget significantly. We may have had transfers, we may have had some revenue increases, but we did cut the budget also. But this situation is perhaps somewhat unique in the sense that the amount that Senator Redfield is suggesting that we cut, as indicated by Senator Wehrbein, has no relationship to the problem that we need to solve. We have a \$296 million gap; \$4.8 million is less than 2 percent, less than 2 percent of the problem, less than 2 percent. It's such a small part of the problem, you have to ask yourself, don't we need to address the larger problem, as Senator Brown has suggested and as you will be asked to do on LB 1090 that's coming forward? Doesn't it make sense to try to solve the larger problem rather than to throw all of these agencies into additional consternation and the cutting now of programs that are valuable in almost every case? The amount of money in total is so small for solving our problem, but to each one of those agencies, because they've been cut at least three times in the past, it is a very significant amount, albeit small in total. So I'm suggesting that we not