

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

March 30, 2004 LB 1089

projections of 6.8 and 6.9 percent growth. Where are we going to be if the growth rate is 2 percent short of that each year, which I feel it very realistically could be? What kind of shape are we going to be in? I feel we have a very major structural imbalance. Senator Brown and others have talked about this is a very small, very small amount of our budget, and it is very small. We have some major issues with Medicaid and other areas that we need to get a handle on, but that doesn't mean that we should just not do this at this time. You know, another issue, I've talked about this before, not very popular for bringing it up, but it's got to do with the retirement plans. You know, we dealt with the State Patrol retirement plan this year. We had to add in from the General Fund budget a couple hundred thousand dollars. If you look on page 11 of our appropriations book, for next year, if I'm reading it right, I think we have to add in \$13 million for the teachers retirement fund, \$13 million, and I believe that's teachers, \$13 million. Two years ago, when we started the new plan for state employees, some of us said at that time that we shouldn't be doing defined benefit plans because it puts the state at risk in the future. And, like, that particular plan may not cause us any problems now, but what might it do in 10 years from now or 15 years from now? We do things that very much can affect the state in the future, and that concerns me very, very much. And so the reason I signed on to Senator Redfield's amendment now, I know it's a very, very small amount in the scheme of things, but we have major problems and we have to start taking a little bit here and a little bit there, and we have to start addressing this issue. So I would like to thank Senator Redfield again and I would yield the rest of my time.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bourne. Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I rise to respond to some remarks that were made earlier of how we need to tax this, we need to tax that, tax the Internet, tax catalog sales and so forth because we're losing out on revenue, and I believe that those statements suggest that it's a net loss to government revenues when the Internet tax-free status is brought about or certainly is brought into the conversation. However, I would still suggest that the economic impact on the state's