

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

May 5, 1999

LB 44

considered part two of the divided question. (FA190, Legislative Journal page 1885.)

SENATOR BROMM: Okay, thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. I would rather...I would rather have taken it in the other order, but that's Senator Chambers' call, because I was going to be able to say that I have no problem with asking for a report and getting a report, and I would even like the report to give us information about how the funds are utilized once they're received. Now, that I...I could support without...without any argument, because then we'd have some...some additional facts and information I think would be helpful to us. Now, the one...the one thing that I...I differ with Senator Chambers on, and this is very crucial to my position in this entire matter. Senator Chambers indicates that these people are...are violating the law; that we have taken an oath to uphold the law, they're violating the law. I'm going to tell you that federal law is different than state law in this area and they are following federal law. And, as federal law applies to a situation and as it goes through federal court, they're not doing anything illegal. The second question I would have is, if it's so clear that they're violating the law as it exists right now, why do we need this law. Why do we need to change the law? The law is clear, Senator Chambers says. They are violating the law. The law, it is very clear, but, yet, we have to come in here with an amendment on the seventy-sixth day to change the law. There's something...there's something not right about that. There's something not logical about that. If they're violating the law then let's have a lawsuit and let's...let's let the courts decide whether they're violating it or not. The courts I think would rule properly, given all the information, the facts and the evidence. We're trying...we're being persuaded here on the floor today that they're violating a law which is clear and we're being asked to change the law. And so, I mean, I don't know, do we have to have a law that says you can't do this and we have to have a law that says...we're going to make a law that says this law says you can't do this? I...I am...this is not logical. Now, I again say this is a subject that needs to be aired, needs to be dealt with, needs to be...and I support division one of the amendment. We're on division two. Division one calls for the report by next session. Let's see how...how...how this money is coming in. I would amend that