

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

April 1, 2004            LB 1090

the electric surcharge, and it has to do with consumption. If you consume a lot, you're going to pay a lot of the surcharge.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: And there are businesses that use a lot of electricity. You could put a cap on that, and you would...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...cut off that problem. Is it time, or is it one minute?

SENATOR CUDABACK: It's time. It is time.

SENATOR LANDIS: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Landis, you are next, so I will recognize you.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. You could put a cap on that and solve it and its economic development problem. But understand the virtues of that idea. It is essentially a sales tax, that's true. On the other hand, it's a tax on something that this state sells comparatively cheaply. Electricity in this state is cheaper than everywhere around us. And we would be adding responsibility, but on an item which is cheaper than our surrounding states. Secondly, there's no border bleeding problem if you use the electric surcharge, because you can't cross the state line and buy electricity and bring it back to Nebraska, which is a problem in the Omaha area with the sales tax idea, and it's a relatively significant one. So what you'd have is, no border bleeding. You'd have a tax based on consumption, which is essentially the idea of the sales tax. It's one of the reasons that people like the sales tax, is because it's based on consumption. And you've have that based on a consumption of something that's relatively cheap. So those are virtues. And I think you get around the vice by capping some amount of total consumption. On the other hand, you know why there's a lot of people out there arguing against the electric surcharge? Because the companies are out there,