

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

April 1, 2004      LB 1090

taxes...let me start over. Here's my frustration. Okay, we have...we have raised taxes, I believe, three times now and I will be honest with you, I supported funding government. And what I'm trying to say is that we're not...I don't know if it's...what the right words are, if we're not thinking long term or what. But, you know, we raise taxes on a temporary basis. We made that tax permanent. Then we expanded the sales tax base. Now we're going to raise the income tax rate that won't pay for either the judgment or for the outlying year's deficit. So I guess what I'm suggesting, and again I want to go back to this, and I know that Senator Beutler has said that that's totally devoid of common sense to do what I'm advocating, but I disagree with him, respectfully. I value his opinion, but I don't think he's right in this situation. It seems to me to make sense to step back, make a logical approach to this, find out exactly how much money we need, find out what the interest rate on the judgment is, find out how much our deficit is. You hear some people from the Appropriations Committee that say the Forecasting Board was exceedingly pessimistic; that there will be 60 or 70 million extra dollars in what we actually receive versus what the Forecasting Board projected. Other members say, no, they're wrong; it will be...they're saying \$104 million below projections, it will be \$150 million below projections. The point that I'm trying to make is nobody knows. If we're going to raise taxes...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: One minute.

SENATOR BOURNE: If we're going to raise taxes, what I suggest we do is raise it to solve a problem. If we're going to raise the hundred-and-some million dollars that we might owe for the judgment, we should do Senator Brashear's plan but with a trigger that if the judgment comes due, then those bonds are let then to satisfy the judgment, not to be issued immediately before the judgment comes due. But what we're being asked to do is we're going to raise taxes today to start funding the judgment and then next year we're going to be asked to raise taxes again to fund the deficit. And I'm...that's my objection. That will mean that we have raised taxes about five times in the last two years and I think, quite honestly, the public has had enough. If we're going to do it, do it once and be done, not