

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

February 3, 2003 LB 385

off onto another subject, you put it in the constitution it's there forever. But, any...that's for another day. But what I am proposing to do, because of the fact that the funds are limited for now, is to use the \$500,000 grant approach at the present time. As that fund grows maybe we can set...I wouldn't be against putting an amendment on there at Select...on Select File that says it would be for five years. I would like to work with anyone, with Senator Aguilar, Senator Beutler, anyone else, Senator Tyson, he has a large city, my good friend behind me, Senator Johnson, who represents a large city. We need...we could sit down on Select File and...before Select File and work something out here. But I believe at the present time, on General File, I believe we should leave the \$500,000 in there and move it ahead and I'll listen to any arguments. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Raikes would move to amend. (FA1152, Legislative Journal page 398.)

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Raikes, you are recognized to open on your amendment.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. This amendment follows the, I guess, suggestion or argument I tried to make when I spoke before, again, referring to the fact that this is an appropriation of General Funds. This is not money that's being collected other than out of the General Fund. What it says, the bill says, is that this...30 percent of this money could be used for, I think the wording is, cultural...cultural, civic, and convention centers, and for new centers or renovation or expansion of existing centers. All of you are aware of the state's fiscal situation. I think all of you are no doubt at least considering the approach that one way out of this for the state has to be to narrow its focus. Some things that looked possible at a time when the fiscal situation was different, okay, but those same things are no longer possible. Because this is really an appropriation of General Funds, I think we should not do it. The specific wording of the amendment is to put both the minimum and the maximum...or strike any reference to a minimum allocation and put the maximum allocation at zero