

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

May 18, 1999

LB 176

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable President, friends all. I rise to introduce this amendment that deals with the Scrap Tire Fund that we have that's a part of the bill. My intent with this is to allow for someone who violates the law to be, in effect, held accountable for that violation. The Scrap Tire Fund is currently utilized with grant money to clean up existing tire piles around the state. In the event that somebody is able to utilize that grant money, utilize in effect the tire fund from \$1 a tire that people have paid into it, and they have been given that money, the abatement has been done, but that they have been in violation of state law, this amendment would allow for the state to recoup those funds. It is something that I have visited with Senator Connealy and Senator Hilgert and others about. It's language that the city of Omaha and the law department helped to draft, and the Department of Environmental Quality has seen it. They added a segment about violation of state law to it. The intent is so that someone is not able to utilize state money to clean something up that they have personally benefited by. So the intent is to keep people utilizing the incentive fund to clean up the tire piles but not to abuse that fund. With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions and would ask for your support of the amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I won't do it but I'm tempted to do a rousing version of a song which first was sung by Tina Turner and then by Credence Clearwater Revival. I listen to all kind of music. It's called "Rolling on the River". When you try to put these tires on this bill, and we're talking about watercraft, I think "Rolling on the River" is appropriate and it's going to roll right over young Senator John Hilgert. This amendment makes a bad situation worse, in my opinion. I'm not talking about the merits of the original tire portion of it, but there is no way you can say that a bill starting out dealing with watercraft can take on all this baggage and not have more than one subject. What the Supreme Court has said is that if a comprehensive piece of legislation is written, but it has to deal with one subject, there can be more items in it than would be the case if a bill started out dealing with one item and then you started adding