

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

March 31, 2004 LB 1090

is a fun place to be following our resident theologian, and I mention this only because I can agree with him that God has a lot of words that quite a few people don't pay much attention to. Amen, selah, let it be. I would take issue with another one of our senators who kind of threw down the gauntlet to the Appropriations Committee, oh, about an hour ago or whenever it was I pushed my light on. Senator Bourne premised that the Appropriations Committee was really concerned about the settlement and nothing much else when we made our proposal. Well, our Chair can speak for the committee, I will speak for myself, but I was there and very alert, and I can assure you, I guarantee you, that if it weren't for the cash flow problem, we would not have been giving serious discussion to these other matters. The settlement was in the background. But in the foreground is cash flow, and if we don't do something, we enter the out years, first job, crawling out of the hole. That's going to be a challenge. Another part of our thought as we were working at it is that if we can get...you know, we appreciate the Governor taking the lead on this and saying there's a gap here that needs to be filled. And sales, income, mix of them, a mix sound pretty good to us but whatever, if we don't do that, then there's a high probability that we have to go back to that \$1.10. As I saw it within the committee, and as others discussed it within the committee, we saw this possibility, this option as a way to give some relief to property tax. The options before us were, first, to pray about the Forecast Board's thing. I've already indicated that I don't consider that a proper use of prayer, and so we can hope. The second option was the \$1.10, and right now that's been taken off the table. The third option is this sales or income or a mix of the two of them. Now back to the Forecast Board, you know we can pick up something there. Let's say that we get half of that last edition, \$55 million, that could make quite a bit of difference adding it to Senator Hartnett's bill. There is the bonding bill. I joined with others. I will vote for a bonding bill which is limited to the liability. I am not interested in putting our assets against current expense. I think that's a bad way to go. But the liability merits it, and the interest rate isn't what some have said because we'd be paying it off with cheaper dollars. So that's needs to be factored into it. Again, we need to do more than bonding. And if we do this, we