

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

March 31, 2004 LB 1090

need to do more than this if we're really going to be prudent about the future. We should not be shutting doors at this possibility at this time. We should look at the possibilities and weigh them carefully. And I'm not saying what we must do. I'm just saying let's look at all of them and not begin to say, well, we got enough, we can go home. I don't see that possibility very close in the future. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SENATOR KREMER: One minute. Thank you, Senator Kruse. Senator Wehrbein, you're recognized to speak.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I want to comment about a couple of things and one is I feel slightly frustrated about some of the comments made about cutting, so I'm going to go into that. But first of all I wanted to...Senator Bourne, to get...mentioned what we'd come to the Revenue Committee about. There were two facets in what the Appropriations Committee recommended to the Revenue Committee. One is going from \$1.05 to \$1.10, which did raise the \$104 million. That covered the loss in revenue at that time. The other...the second part of that was that we recommended an equivalent of a half cent sales tax, and we used the number of \$122 million, to cover the low-level nuclear waste issue. Those were both. So going from \$1.05 to \$1.10 and a half cent sales tax or its equivalent would have taken us to the outside year, June 30, 2007, would have taken us to about \$35 million below settlement, below even, below the...and that we would have covered our minimum reserve and we would have paid for the low-level nuclear waste site at \$151 million and it would include using some money from the Cash Reserve. Those are the two things that we originally started out with two weeks ago. Going to \$1.10 and using the equivalent of a half cent sales tax or \$122 million would have taken us to that outside line which now shows \$294 million on your green sheet. That line, under our recommendation, would have been \$35 million below the line. Pretty close for being almost three years out, I would think you would have to agree. Pretty close for being three years out. And so that's where we're at. Now the second thing that I want to talk about is the comments made today about we got to cut the budget, we got to do some more for structure. And I'm going to read some of the things that we're doing and where our expenses