

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

May 9, 2001

LB 536, 620

Senator Coordsen, followed by Senator Chambers.

SENATOR COORDSEN: I apologize to the body. I think I should have been not voting on the last issue, so that we could have reconsidered that vote. I support LB 620. I support the potential for the impact that it has. But what bothers me about the last vote was that there are interwoven, and I don't think...I don't think that it is at the insistence of those who would probably be acknowledged to be of primary interest in at least a 3-D section of this bill, but there is potential for abuse by future users of this renewal of the Quality Jobs Act if we're not cautious in laying the groundwork. It's easy sometimes to vote "yes" without thinking what the impact might be. We looked at this issue quite thoroughly in Revenue Committee, which is typical, and this is one thing that we did overlook, the issue of how to count the employees. And I understand that I'm attracting a lot of attention, so I will close with that and let the body pass what they desire to pass, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Senator Chambers, motion...or I mean on advancement of LB 620.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, from the very beginning the idea and the issue of what constitutes an employee and how employees are to be counted took a lot of my time. I continued to hammer on it again, and again, and again, day, after day, after day. Well, now the train has left the station. It's too late to call it back. I'm going to vote against this bill because I do not agree with it; I do not agree with these types of bills. One of the worst votes that occurred was the refusal to eliminate these ethanol boondoggles from this bill. The fact that they're getting an outright subsidy from the General Fund and being allowed to double-dip through this bill is unconscionable. It could be based on inattention. Maybe the body was tired. But whatever the reason was for rejecting Senator Dierks' amendment, there is no excuse for that vote, in my opinion. It just means I'm going to have to fight harder against LB 536 and maybe some other items too. Because a vote of that kind is like opening a new front in the battle. The battle over LB 620 I have lost. That was lost in