

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

March 31, 2004      LB 1090

making a commitment early. I think they will be necessary, not saying that, but I think they will be necessary to make those, but this will amount to more of a commitment. And we will have to decide...we won't...we really can't be turning back next year when we come back, like there would have been if we'd gone to the \$1.10 because...and we could have had some adjustment to that. So once we make our decision on one of these three, we are pretty well committed to where we're headed. That's...I simply wanted to highlight those differences. I think this will make a commitment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: And we are going to either be withholding, we're going to be charging a surcharge, or we'll be starting our way down the method of doing the bonding, but it will be a decision. And so it's actually much more irreversible than if we would delay...go the \$1.10 route, knowing that we could save the \$100 million in next year. So there's...I think in a lot ways it's a very complex decision and I think this debate this morning will be very healthy in determine...understanding all the options. But I would hope that you would consider that it is not an option to do nothing. We ought to be really looking at which one of the three is the one you prefer, and I think in a sense you could still throw in the sales tax. So with that, that's all I have to say at this point, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. (Visitors introduced.) On with discussion of the Beutler amendment, Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members. I stand reluctantly to oppose the Beutler amendment. I'm not going to support this kind of solution, although I do agree with the Appropriations Committee that we do need to be cognizant that the chickens are going to come home to roost sooner or later. So I think that having all these options before us is very good. I'm just saying that I won't be supporting this primarily because I believe that many of our citizens are already in circumstances which are not very desirable. They are already living on fixed incomes. They are already subject to