

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

March 3, 2004

LB 962

Senator Vrtiska asked that question in a straightforward way. My amendments are designed, Senator Vrtiska, to put what parts of the bill I can into a shape where, if I wind up supporting it, at least some of these glaring things won't be a part of the bill. If there are big areas, for example, where we're talking about dispute resolution, even if it cannot be amended the way I would like to see it amended, if I'm convinced that should be done, that...well, wait a minute. I'm not going to let you know all the cards in my hand. (Laugh) But let me leave the answer where I gave it. I think this is essential legislation. This is something which I agree ought to have been done a long time ago. I think some of the points Senator Beutler made, Senator Vrtis...I meant Senator Schrock made about activities going on right now that need regulation of the kind in this bill, that will push me into saying that, yeah, we've got to do something. But even with that gun, so to speak, to my head--and I use that for...and Senator Tyson isn't even here. I was trying to give him something, even, to show how collegial I am. This bill constitutes a work product based on a lot of effort by a lot of people. Even though I think the makeup of the task force leaves a great deal to be desired, the fact that it comes before us gives us a shot at it. But it makes some of us have to take issue, because the bill as it's moving now is skewed in one direction, and we have to try to pull it back toward a balanced position, to the extent that we can. And that's what I'm trying to do. And I'm trying to show, by the kind of amendments that I'm offering, how carefully I have read this bill. There are other things of the nature of the stuff in a bill that I'm amending that I saw in other parts of the bill, but I'm not going to be as detailed in amendments there. Scattered...once we get past page 12 or 13, or whatever the first part of this is--I can't tell you the page number--the number of amendments that I have will diminish. Intent language always poses the most difficult area of a bill for me, if the bill itself has value. Personally, I don't see why we need a laundry list of all of these things in this intent language, because none of it is binding. If I would have been authorized or commissioned to write intent language for what is going to be LB 962, it could be done much more simply, much less...with much less confusion than exists in the current bill. But the intent language is existing law. That was not drafted by the task force. The only