

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

April 12, 2005 LB 480

Fair bill that said that Lincoln would have to come up with some money if we were going to have the State Fair here in our city. And I voted for that, Senator Bourne, because I thought there could be a good rationale for doing that. In retrospect, I'm not sure I should have done that, because Lincoln is really strapped right now, and they are having trouble coming up with that money. But it did seem like a reasonable thing to request. I don't think this is a reasonable thing to request. For one thing, there's not going to be an end to smoking in Lincoln. There's going to be an end to smoking in those public areas, like restaurants and bars that serve food. There are still going to be people who buy cigarettes. There will still be an opportunity to tax them. And if I'm understanding the Bourne amendment, it would not allow taxes to be collected at all on tobacco. I think we have to be careful when we are advocating consistency, because we all try to be consistent. But I bet, if you followed any one member around, even Senator Chambers perhaps, there would be some times that we could argue, at least, that that person isn't being consistent. I think that consistency is all in the eye of the beholder. Senator Chambers may not support a seat belt law because he doesn't believe that government should be interfering. On the other hand, in the case of cigarette smoke, he may feel that that is a...more of a community issue, and one that affects other people as well. So maybe he isn't being so inconsistent after all. It depends on how you set your criteria. Senator Beutler said very well what I wanted to say, and that is that federal laws are mostly punitive towards states that do not pass certain laws. And that isn't...that is the case...that is not the case in this amendment that we're talking about. This amendment wants to punish local government for being more proactive on this issue. Yet we have other policies, examples of policies at the state or local level, that are more stringent than federal or state requirements. Consistent policy on No Child Left Behind, for instance, has attempted to be enacted across all the states. Yet, just this week, the feds have announced that they are relaxing rules and regs, and letting the states have more latitude and more say about what does happen at the local level, and to have more decision making. Now, how that all works out, one doesn't know at this point.