

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

March 18, 2004 LB 1089
 LR 209

the event we took the \$300,000 off, and you continued to oppose LR 209CA, vote against it, speak a couple of times against, but we wouldn't go to the mat, we wouldn't have this scorched earth, cloture, that kind of a problem, we could work on...you know, we'd have a debate, orderly, you can get to all the issues in an hour, believe me, and then vote on LR 209CA, knowing you were going to vote against it, and I got up with you and recommended that we took the 300,000 bucks out. No. No. In other words, for those of us who care about the State Fair, we got two proposals. This one, which takes out \$300,000--and by the way, we have also...we have cut prizes in the past, and it has affected participation. We know that from history. You cut the prizes, you cut participation. You'd like to think it isn't true, but in fact it is true. Is it the biggest piece of the puzzle? No, it's not. Is it an Achilles heel? Is it a piece around which we should be able, perhaps, to make a reasoned decision? Yes. On the other hand, I think the notion that says, look, if you are going to take this out, shouldn't we be able to have an orderly debate in a timely way without facing cloture on LR 209CA and see where the votes are? That to me is reasonable. That was an offer I made; it was declined. So in my estimation, what happens is, we get \$300,000 out, and a big fight on LR 209CA, when at least some of this body wants to do something for the State Fair, which is sort of problematical here. Could...do I think that there's room for taking some money out here that might be able to made up from the private sector or someplace else? Yes, there probably is. But what we're doing is we're dropping the shoe when Senator Chambers said, you know, you better do what I told you to do on LR 209CA, and if you don't, I'll make it painful for you someplace else. He's doing that now, and we're doing the other half of the coin. So I think there's a bit of a problem there. Senator Wehrbein, I've got to tell you, if you tell me to take the deal, I will...that's important to me. Your leadership is important to me. If in your calculation that's the wisest, I understand. From my perspective, if that wasn't there, I would vote no on this amendment, and live with the results. On the other hand, I do think there are bigger fish to fry than the State Fair \$300,000 prize money at the moment, and we need to move on to that, which is why I think we should be able to move on tomorrow with a rules suspension. But if we can't get there, we need to