

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

March 22, 2006 LB 968

he thinks the right numbers would be, so that if he's successful and we go back to work, what would the targets that the Revenue Committee ought to try to aim for be? And that would be, I think, a helpful way of furthering the discussion. I hope between now and the closing that that will be done. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Further discussion on the motion to bracket? Senator Kruse, followed by Senator Redfield and others.

SENATOR KRUSE: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I stand in support of the bracket motion for reasons that have already been well stated by Senator Beutler and Senator Landis. This is a good time to talk about it. This is a good time to weigh the options that we have. I am very interested in the tax cut package. I commend the Revenue Committee for an excellent job of providing a package with balance. I just think it's too rich. We can't really afford it. The only way we can afford it is by raiding our reserve funds, and I frankly don't consider that wise. I have voted against even the small adds that we've been thinking about in the last few weeks, some of them for wonderful things like motherhood, but have still voted against them because I feel we are at an edge and I am interested in a tax cut package, the committee is. We had no interest at all in putting any candidate in an embarrassing situation. We want to provide a tax cut. I like very much the proposal that Senator Janssen lifted up of home repair labor as one that would have priority within that. But again, to state why it's too rich, I look at the Beutler handout, line 41, and in the out year we have \$32 million. The proposal that we are now considering would take \$240 million out of that. I don't think your banker would let you do that. Now, the only way to get around that is to assume that our revenue will increase. I would hope it would (laugh), but I really wouldn't want to vote that way. Our revenue forecast is done on a reasonable basis and we should assume that it's a good one. I would urge that we have the Revenue Committee reconsider what they have before us and make trims again, not wipe it out. We need to provide a balance in this election year. I stand in favor of passing a tax cut, but I consider this too rich. On the second page, line 27, we're down to \$195 million in the hole. That's, again, only possible