

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

February 8, 1999 LB 211

understandable. If there's a lease agreement, yeah, that's what they're doing. Is the state leasing a building to an individual, organization or entity? If there is a lease agreement, yes. Does the state own the building? And that is easy to establish. So this amendment that Senator Beutler is offering does not lack clarity. We know what it means. We are establishing a policy. We are talking about buildings in which the state has an interest, buildings where taxpayer money is going to be spent. The rationale for these payoffs from these tobacco companies is that the states have had to spend...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...large amounts of money rehabilitating and treating the illnesses of its citizens caused by tobacco products. So, on the one hand, the state wants to take that money and others in this Legislature want to take that money, but then they want to leave state buildings open to the very activity that is creating the justification for taking that money from the tobacco industry. We need, in my opinion, to adopt Senator Beutler's amendment.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. There being no further lights on, Senator Beutler, you're recognized to close on your amendment to LB 211.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator (sic) Maurstad, members of the Legislature, let me try to be clear on where we are and what the amendment does. The amendment does not expand in any way the Tyson amendment. It does not expand in any way the Tyson amendment. Where we are is this. Senator Tyson put his amendment up. His amendment talked about any state building. Through a series of questions from myself and others, we determined that by what he meant and intended was any building owned by the state, any building leased to the state insofar as that portion of the building that's leased to the state is concerned, and any building that the state leases to someone else. All of that was established as legislative intent in the discussion of Senator Tyson's amendment. What I did was put that in writing. If you do not adopt my amendment, you're actually creating enormous confusion because you seem to be rejecting an intent that was stated by Senator Tyson, and so