

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

April 22, 2003 LB 759

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Legislature, if you're looking on what Senator Chambers calls your gadget, you can see the upcoming work. Senator Quandahl has put the earmarking question squarely before us in this case. I think Senator Chambers has made the opening salvo of his argument on the budget. My guess is that our roll call votes will come back on various budgetary priorities. Senator Chambers has fainted with a left hook and we're about ready to get the uppercut when it comes budget time. He's done that today. I just want to point out where we are at four o'clock in the afternoon. Following the Quandahl amendment, there is sort of a carry over of where we were before. Senator Janssen has one on the Riverfront, which is I think the mud flats. Is that right? We did the ditch a little earlier, and apparently we're going to revisit the mud flats, unless the Quandahl amendment is successful. But that's the end of the ones on the cigarette tax. Following that comes the income tax. In the event we have a focused debate on the Quandahl amendment, and in the event we have a focused debate on the Janssen amendment, seems to me that we could finish the day with two of the major pieces of this bill at least dealt with by the floor. I would suggest one thing that I want to point out here; that this piece of the...of what's called the Brashear plan is actually the invention of the Revenue Committee. This did not appear in LB 759 to begin with. This is the work of the Revenue Committee saying, look, this is a legitimate place to look for revenue, and if I get to censor this, it's not that we don't want to do this, it's just that we're not exactly sure where we want the money to go. At that point, if we can exercise some restraint among ourselves, we could answer the question if this 30 or 40 million bucks is in the pot or not, and then we could move on to the topic of the income tax and we would have a couple of our major pieces solved, or at least we would have gotten on record today, which I think would be a valuable day to have done it. I intend to oppose the Quandahl amendment. I've been voting against the earmarking pieces. I agree with Senator Beutler's point of view. And I'll yield the remainder of my time to Senator