

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

May 17, 1999

LB 382

SENATOR LYNCH: Withdraw, please.

CLERK: The next item I have on the bill, Senator Chambers, AM...FA232. It's the one you just gave me, Senator. (FA232, Legislative Journal page 2169.)

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Senator Chambers, you are recognized to open on your amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, if this is on your gadget, you'll see that what I'm dealing with, in the first one, the first part of it is a definition, it would be page 2, line 8, after "means" I would insert the word "new", just to keep everything consistent, because what we're talking about is new revenue, referring to that which would not otherwise have been available but for the convention and the spending by the conventioners. Then, if you go to line 16, after the word "term", I inserted the words "on the board". And the purpose of that is to make it clear that this economics professor's appointment relates to two...a two-year term on the board. Then it's clear that it doesn't mean this person may have been appointed to the college or anything else, it just makes clear, the way I would like it to be clear, that this person is being appointed to this board by the Coordinating Commission. Those are the two parts to the amendment. If you have any questions, I'll answer them.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. The next light that's on is Senator Brashear's. Senator Brashear. We'll move to Senator Landis, is the next light.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature. I looked at this amendment and the word "new" here is consistent with the principles of the bill, and it's not...doesn't have any effect. The other one is, I think, clarifying something that probably doesn't need clarification but, nonetheless, undoes an ambiguity. I do have to say that we're now at the level of amendment which I think might be inspired by the bet that was made earlier between Senator Tyson and Senator Chambers, because, if I understand correctly, if we were to wrap this bill up in let's say the next half an hour, I believe, Senator Tyson, you'd be the winner of the stake, if I