

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

May 14, 2003

LB 407

undertaken in the past. Sometimes they're fruitful; many times they aren't. But it is my hope that if we decide, if there's an expression of support for this, that we undertake a serious study and that it would take a fair amount of time, and that we would come back with any suggestions by next session and I would hope that we'd be looking at big picture items here: how could we organize ourselves in a more efficient way, both from the standpoint of government and education, from top to bottom; how could our tax system be a more equitable or efficient tax system than what it is. This would not be an easy task, but I think it's one that needs to be undertaken. One of the things that has struck me in years past but it's probably more noticeable I think to me this year, is that the way we ourselves even are organized within the Legislature. We put a lot of responsibility on the Appropriations Committee. We expect them to be experts in education, health and human services, in the judiciary area, corrections. Basically all the major areas they are expected to be pretty much experts. On the other hand, those of us who serve on other committees, whether it be Education or Health and Human Services, we delve into great detail in our respective subject areas but we're not on Appropriations Committee and we don't see some of the detail that they see in terms of the finances. And I think Adrian Smith, Senator Smith's, amendment today is an example of that. We have Health and Human Services that has a lot of expertise in a given area, but we do have significant decisions being made by the Appropriations Committee. And I don't...I'm not suggesting that this study would reorganize that for us, but that's just one minor example of I think the big picture that we need to look at for years to come in how we best equip ourselves to deal with the challenges that are not going to end in 2003. The tax problems aren't going to end. The need for money, the need for government is not going to end, and it's always good, I think, to look at how we could become a little better orderly house than what we are, and so I suggest this. If you feel you'd rather not do it in the bill, I'll try to introduce it as an interim study as well, but I think it has a little bit more meaning and a little bit more emphasis, it does mean we really mean it, if we put it in the law and especially if it's in the mainline appropriations bill. So that's the purpose of it, Mr. President. Thank you.