

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

January 31, 2001 LB 225

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: We are debating the advancement of LB 225. Senator Chambers, you're recognized. This is the advancement of LB 225, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh, thank you.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: I was recognizing your light.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. This is that terrible bill that we've been talking about. I had the opportunity during the hearing yesterday before the Ag Committee to draw a comparison between the way this bill, LB 225, is being handled and one that deals with carbon sequestration. Now on that carbon sequestration bill, we were told that it was going to be something of substance that will benefit landowners, that will keep carbons in the soil by disturbing it, and all the other wonderful things that would happen, and the Governor vetoed the money out of that bill, which suggests that it's not too important, but he did suggest that they go with a tin cup to one of these agencies that I think they get money from the lottery and ask them for some money. So the question that occurred to me, and I raised it before the committee members, if that program was deemed to be one of substance, why would the Governor veto the money out of that bill, and yet we're battling on a bill on the floor of the Legislature dealing with venture capital and there is no measurable result that anybody can expect to be shown? And I drew that comparison to try to alert my colleagues to why I'm fighting against LB 225. It is not a bill of substance. Highly political is what I think it is. That carbon sequestration bill is supported by people in the rural areas to the best of my knowledge, but their money was taken away. There had to be a study and an assessment made to determine certain aspects of this program, how they impact, and so forth. That money was taken away. Here you have a bill that wants to throw \$200,000 into a pot which will be spent to do things that can be done, and to some extent these things are being done already without the expenditure of extra public money. If the Department of Economic Development would do what it is supposed to do, we would not have this bill before us, but the reason we have it is not because DED cannot do what it is supposed to do. We have it