

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

May 7, 2003

LB 462, 520, 540

Revenue Committee did not shirk on this responsibility. The bills were introduced. They were heard. The committee took action. And I think I voted with the majority. The action was to kill the bill. So if this issue deserves to go further, I would suggest to you the route for that is to introduce a bill next session before the...and Senator Jensen...or Janssen suggests to me he will...introduce a bill next session that probably would be referred again to the Revenue Committee, and the issue can be brought up again. Perhaps you can make better arguments next time, Senator Janssen. But at this point, the appropriate thing to do is not to adopt this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Raikes. We've been speaking. Senator Redfield, I've had an opportunity to review the question that you raised, which involved the killing of LB 462 and LB 520. And I find that under the applicable rule, which is Rule 6, that all of LB 462 and substantially most of LB 520 is contained in this amendment. So I think it would require 30 votes. That would be the decision of the Chair. That decision can be challenged. But that would be the way we would see it. Senator Kruse.

SENATOR KRUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I would not be capable of evaluating this exotic formula, and certainly can't come up with a better one of my own. I would agree with Senator Raikes that this is probably not the place. But I cannot pass up the opportunity to say, there's one thing that would really improve this to the point that I would become an evangelist for it, and that would be an addition that levy caps would be removed. I simply put it out here as a model, that this is what we should be doing. In our work on that and in my particular bill on that, I discovered that levy caps are a screwed-up way to run a railroad. They simply don't work. One size fits all. But one size doesn't fit all. And different areas, different jurisdictions, have different evaluations. And we act like it all fits together, and so on. And then we fall back on the argument of local control. Well, I'm quite unimpressed with local control that depends upon a vote. That's not local control. That's local uncontrol, in a lot of cases. That is intimidation, and jeopardy, and all kinds of things that