

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

March 23, 1999 LB 495

ASSISTANT CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See page 1147 of the Legislative Journal.) The vote is 25 ayes, 16 nays on the adoption of Senator Stuhr's amendment.

SENATOR COORDSEN: The Stuhr amendment is adopted. The call is raised. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wehrbein would move to amend with AM0958. (See amendment on pages 1147-1148 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR COORDSEN: Senator Wehrbein, to open on your amendment.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you, Mr. President, members. This is the amendment I talked about. I'm not sure of the status of this bill, and I assume that some in this last position were in a position to vote for the amendment, even though you may be against the bill, because the amendment at least is not the green copy, which I'm sure no one is...no one, that's not fair, not many are for, probably, the green copy. This is an alternative. I don't know whether to call it a consensus or a compromise, but it's an alternative and it is helpful to me; perhaps not all the right reasons, perhaps not all the wrong reasons. It makes it a one-time funding, \$3.2 million, only; takes out the out-years, the continuing funding. If calculations are approximately right it's \$3.2 million, we'd go in for a one-time injection, and then the out-years would be nothing, which apparently was estimated to be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1 million. I was listening to the comments, and that's why I don't know whether I want ownership of this or not. But it does meet some of the concerns within this body about the fact that it is not a significant amount of money. Maybe 1 million is different than 3 million. It would give a one-time injection of equipment and things like that, that should help some vocational programs. Hopefully the money would be used wisely for one-time use, perhaps training the teachers, some type of thing like that. But the other thing is that it does meet that concern that this is gambling money. And I don't know how widespread that is in here, frankly. It is bothersome to me, but I did say maybe it's a rationalization. But the point is that I was...I've been opposed to all gambling bills, but we have it, and now we and I are in a position to have to