

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

April 2, 2004

LB 1091

the way, so nobody will be saying I'm withdrawing in defeat. I will ultimately...I'm trying to foreclose that argument, Senator Chambers. I'm going to step out of the way and all of you who want to vote for Senator Bromm's amendment, which he's carrying because it is his duty as he sees it, can vote for it. I just simply won't be able to join you. So for the rest of my time, having laid out what I've done, I want to rail a bit. You do all understand that this lawsuit that we've talked so much about was won by a Lincoln law firm representing the compact and they charged \$3 million. That's our good Nebraska homegrown product. And it was defended at somebody's brilliant instigation by a Washington, D.C., law firm that charged \$25 million. And somebody approved those bills, if they knew...if they'd ever...if they had the competence to judge what \$25 million worth of legal work is even worth. And for \$25 million, we the people didn't get told seven years ago to adjust the statute, six sessions ago to adjust the statute, five sessions ago to adjust the statute, four sessions ago to adjust the statute, three sessions ago to adjust the statute, two sessions ago to adjust the statute, not even one session ago did we get told to adjust the statute. No, we're riding in here, true Nebraska style, day late, dollar short, horses out of the barn, and we think we can adjust the statute. We think we can change the rate. This is not Senator Bromm's fault, and I keep saying if it costs us \$25 million to lose this suit, aren't we glad? What would it have cost us to win? This amendment is intended to save the state approximately \$9 million, and it's a great idea if it'd work, but it won't. There will be any number of grounds to challenge it. Start with the fact that it violates the one subject rule. Attaching this amendment to LB 1091 will produce an unconstitutional act. I call that to the attention of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The one subject rule is an easy standard to meet, but adding this amendment to LB 1091 will violate it. This is an act relating to funds. AM3529 does not relate to funds and I do not think we can conceive of a subject that encompasses both the main part of LB 1091 and AM3529. It's important for this body to understand that when an act violates the one subject rule, both parts of the bill fall. Therefore, if there's a legal challenge to this act, and there's little reason to use the word "if," when there is a legal challenge to this act, if successful, the fund