

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

April 17, 2001 LB 620

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Chambers, you're recognized to close.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, we have problems with this bill, let alone applications that are going to be submitted pursuant to the bill. I'm going to be offering amendments to try to reconcile some of this language and clarify what the bill says, even though I don't like it. The problem with this bill is the problem...some of you all don't like Machiavelli, but he was really a clear-thinking, clear-writing individual, but he wasn't too organized and he wasn't too systematic in what he presented. That wasn't what he was intending to do, but he's known as the father of political science. But what he would do is sometimes use the same word to express different ideas, the same word expressing different ideas. Then he would take different words to express the same idea. So you were never completely sure exactly what idea he was trying to convey even though, when you read the words, you understood the words, you understood the sentence, but you didn't know for sure what the sentence meant. In this bill the same words are used to express different ideas, and different words are used to express the same idea. If, when we're talking about employees and the term "equivalent employee" is used in one place and that place cross-refers to "base year employee" in the definition, and when you go to that definition you see that "employee" means "individual", not "equivalent employee", then you have a difference in what is meant. So when an application is presented to this board and the term "equivalent employee" or the term "individual" is used, what precisely does that mean? This amendment of mine is very simple and it should be adopted. But when we get to the underlying amendment that Senator Wickersham is talking about, I believe it, by its very nature, will cause these people to think more carefully about every aspect of the process. Even if they use one of these models and say, we don't think it applies exactly, it can put them in a frame of mind and trigger a pattern of thinking that suits them to evaluate these applications. They will not look at this application in the same way they look at a newspaper. They will not read it in the same way they read political slogans and political propaganda. They will read it as a document which is