

May 8, 1995

LB 429

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Okay. I just want to make a comment that once again this is cash funds. We've reduced General Fund accordingly as this cash fund has been...is due to kick in and so that's the reason for accounting for it. It should be clear to the body that if we did not do this bill it would really have no affect the..on the agency because they would simply have this money going into one larger account instead of this more specific account, which is what we're after here. That's all we're trying to do is create this specific account so those can more easily be audited and failure to pass this is not serious except that it does make that emissions fund a part of a larger account which will be more difficult to track. So that's the reason for this fund creation that we're proposing in this committee amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam President, and very briefly I'd like to say once again I do support the amendment. The amendment will not affect the situation that I'm talking about. This simply creates a tax...or the cash fund as Senator Wehrbein indicates. I would like to, Senator Chambers, you did bring something into focus which I'd like to...to continue with another comment on, not to belabor this a great deal on this particular bill, but I agree with you there are rights that transcend, that should transcend the boundary lines of the states, and very clearly if they weren't...if they weren't federally...federally generated and federally regulated, those rights would never have reached some people in some states and that's the kind of thing I can wholeheartedly support the federal government instigating and requiring and encouraging in every way possible. I find myself maybe being able to draw a line and distinguish that from the situation of where they make a law which requires us to test air or test water for many things that we never see in our air or experience in our air or in our water and, whereas in California or in New York or in Florida it might be entirely different, they may see those things and they may experience those things and they may need the...the personnel and the equipment to test for those things and there they should. But to require this across all 50 states, when it comes to that kind of an issue, that's where I'd like to draw some time and say, you know, go ahead because we don't have that problem in Nebraska and we're not going to spend the money for it, we don't have the extra money, we're going to