

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

April 1, 2004 LB 1090

issue for the situation we're facing right now, it's probably a good idea longer term. The other thing I would do is vote for AM3477. I think I'm interested in a very restrictive interpretation. Again, I'll make a...remake a point I made or tried to make yesterday. I don't see what you give up by doing that. I know several people have expressed fear and trepidation about getting into bonding and so on, and with the implied reasoning that all this is toward the path of sin or whatever, I think this body over the years, at least, cursorily at least, has demonstrated responsibility. I don't think it would change from that. Bonding would simply allow us to...or the type of bonding, contingency bonding that I have in mind, would allow us to address a financial need at the time and if it comes about. It would not wipe out any options there forward that I can see. You could still go ahead with a sales tax or income tax or some other kind of combination and address the financial need and undo the bonds at that point. So again, I'm not sure I understand why you wouldn't do this amendment. I will tell you that the other thing I'm interested in is the income tax proposal that Senator Hartnett first came up with and I'm interested in that because it is a viable alternative to a property tax increase and the body, I think, has made its opinion clear on a property tax increase. An income tax would be an alternative to that and the particular nature of the income tax proposal Senator Hartnett had would move our income tax structure more toward the middle of the pack, if you will, as compared to our surrounding states. So I would be interested in that, but I...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...do not expect to get 24 people to go along with me on that. I am not interested in a sales tax rate increase. I think if we're going to do more on sales tax, what we need is a base expansion. I think that's the direction we should go. I am also not interested in a surcharge on electricity and, again, I think Senator Wehrbein gave me the main reason for that. This is a new mechanism. I don't really think that it makes good sense for us to try to implement a new mechanism at this point. So with that, thank you.