

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

May 3, 1999

LB 382

legislation. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Peterson. For discussion on the Chambers amendment, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, about 20 minutes ago to a half an hour ago, we were really on the guts of the bill and we were really talking about whether this thing made sense or not, and that was a valuable time in the discussion. I want to make a point related to what I thought was the substantive discussion that we had and that was the interpretation of Section 8 and whether or not the finding made on the basis of the testimony submitted to the board as to the impact of participant spending was controlling and it's not. Here's what you take a look at as to what gets reimbursed. Page 7, line 6, if an application is approved, the board shall, line 7, audit or review audits of the approved convention. That's number one. Line 13, number two, determine the amount of attributable revenue with regard to construction of the eligible facility, employment at the eligible facility, and out-of-state participants attending the conventions that were not held in the state. In other words, that's the authority to set the limit where the construction multiplier and the information before the board justifies, where the employment numbers and the multiplier can be shown to the board, and where the participants and participation can be shown to the board and applied against the multiplier. That's where the bill works. And by the way, page 7, line 18 says that the application, once approved, will have the board certify the amount of attributable revenue to the State Treasurer. That's where it all turns on. We're back to sputtering over adjectives and adverbs and it's unfortunate that we've moved off what I thought was a valuable and substantive discussion. I would say this, that if, as with most any piece of legislation, there's probably additional things to say that could be used to clarify. There are additional statements to be made. There are ways of harmonizing language that could be done to LB 382, it would be appropriate to do to LB 382, Senator Chambers will keep us from doing that. However, Senator Chambers would have us believe that if we don't do what he's keeping us from doing the bill won't work, and that's false. Senator Chambers is mistaken on that score. LB 382 is in a position where if, even if he were successful in keeping any