

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

April 28, 1999 LB 382

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time. There being no other lights on, Senator Chambers, you're recognized to close on your motion to reconsider.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. In case people don't know what we're trying to...what we're reconsidering, we're reconsidering the last amendment. (Laugh) There are so many things in this bill that show it's dishonesty that it would boggle the mind of those who really are serious about making sure the public is not hoodwinked, who are interested in not doing a fast shuffle or being a part of a flimflam. I bet I could tell without reading from the text of this more what's in it than people who worked on it in putting it together, because I read it and I paid attention. We're really going to have fun when we get down to the crumb snatcher part. See, if...when Omaha, who's going to get the lion's share, comes in, they've got to go to this board that has five people, including an economist named by some group of people who are professors or something or other. Senator Cudaback, if all the economists in the world were laid end to end they couldn't reach a conclusion, and if they did it would be wrong. Now they've just put together this board so they can say, we got some people who are going to make a decision here, but I don't see any connection between the people on the board and this kind of a project that is being envisioned. So here's what happens, Senator Cudaback. Omaha gets 70 percent of let's say this throw-back money is generated and all of you all out there in greater Nebraska, as it's called, get 30 percent to spread among 92 counties, 92 counties, but all the...any cities that might be in there too, 30 percent of this, not the \$210 million that is the cost of the project, but 70 percent of this money from people from outside the state, although there's a question as to whether that's true even. Many important issues in this bill leave you hanging because the bill does not definitively, by its terms, state what is really going to be required or what is really allowed. Then they mix definitions. They put different elements into the definition based on where it occurs in the bill. I don't want to correct that. I want that to stay just like it is. I want these geniuses to have their genius appreciated. They did all of this work, got all these high-powered smart people together, got all my colleagues from Omaha signing on to this genius piece