

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

May 21, 2003

LB 608

we're doing. In this instance, the workers should be given more consideration than they will be under Senator Bromm's underlying amendment. So I will not say much at this point, but I will say something when I get...when we get to Senator Beutler's amendments. I have to say, with reference to Senator Landis, I had hung some label on him the other day. I think it was "Mr. T" for trickster, tricky, trickery. Well, I want to amend that. I'm going to pull it for now and his name will be designated by the two letters "GG". Youngsters won't know what this substance is, but that "GG" is for goose grease. When somebody is as smooth as goose grease that person is smooth. Senator Landis' explanation as far as it went with reference to the underlying amendment of Senator Bromm's laid out an argument that is very persuasive in terms of Senator Bromm's amendment being better than what would exist without it. He pointed out very clearly, and I hope note was taken of it, that information which these companies under LB 775 would be required to report is not going to give us the type of knowledge we're requesting and the public is seeking. Under Senator Bromm's amendment that will not be achieved. But Senator Bromm's amendment will eliminate something which not only is unhelpful, it is a detriment. It is one of those things which could give the impression that something very consequential has been achieved but, in effect, and, in fact, nothing will have been achieved and the situation will have been made worse. So he gave an argument for accepting Senator Bromm's underlying amendment, but I think Senator Beutler is going to have some better arguments as to why we...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...should modify that amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Landis, on the Bromm amendment.

SENATOR LANDIS: I'd call the question on the Bromm amendment to the Bromm amendment so we can get to the underlying questions that I think Senator Beutler has.