

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

March 31, 2004 LB 1090

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...they would benefit too.

SENATOR SCHROCK: But if a...

SENATOR BEUTLER: If a farmer is low-income, he would benefit also.

SENATOR SCHROCK: But...so you're saying if a farmer was low-income, showed no income, then they would be exempt from paying the surcharge?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, Senator, the Power Review Board would be setting up the rules and regulations to do that, and rather than to get into that at this level, at this point in time, I would be content to let them do the fair thing.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Okay. Well, I don't know what that is. I think there's some unforeseen circumstances here. The ethanol industry, I know, is heavily dependent on electricity for their inputs. I did vote for the \$1.07 and I do want a solution. I kind of like Senator Hartnett's approach, a little more income tax. I would even vote for Senator Brashear's proposal. Maybe I'd water it down a little bit, pardon the pun. Maybe it wouldn't have to be quite so much money, and maybe instead of a 30-year bond, I'd do a 15-year bond. It doesn't matter. But I think some property tax increase maybe is appropriate. It is a business deduction for agriculture, for what that's worth. I didn't vote for the \$1.10. I voted for the \$1.07. If someone would come up with a proposal that would be a little income tax on Senator Hartnett's, maybe cut his income tax in half and go to \$1.06, I think that's a compromise I could vote for. I'd jump on that. But I'm not going to support the surcharge on electricity. That's a new tax. I don't think we're ready to go there, at least I'm not. But if 25 of you see it that way, so be it. I'll give the rest of my time back to the Chair.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Senator Janssen, followed by Senator Foley, Kruse, Johnson, and Baker, and 11 others.