

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

May 6, 2005

LB 542

think the last thing we need to be considered is alarmists. Let's try to be objective. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: Thank you, Senator Smith. Senator Schrock, followed by Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of the Legislature, Senator Chambers, I would like to, I would like to serve on this task force, but you know me--don't tax me, tax the man behind the tree. That's my attitude. And, yes, I am production agriculture. I would like to support this bill. I'm not opposed to the concept. I just don't believe the details are worked out. And I wasn't paying too much attention till Senator Beutler talked about the Water Policy Task Force. And let me share with you why I think the Water Policy Task Force, in my opinion--some may disagree--in my opinion, was successful. The Water Policy Task Force hired a facilitator who had expertise in international water issues, and was very excellent. I would also tell you, we had expertise from the Department of Natural Resources. Roger Patterson cochairs the task force with me, and he will be there long after I'm gone, because that position automatically goes to the Chair of the Natural Resources Committee. And Roger is a good person, as far as being a consensus builder. We had expertise with Ann Bleed, who is our state hydrologist. We had expertise from the... from the Attorney General's Office and Dave Cookson. And together, we worked together. We used scientific evidence, we used what was happening in other states. I think this tax policy task force can be successful. My trouble is, I only see one expert on there on tax policy, and that's the one appointed by the Revenue Committee. There probably should be five experts on tax policy, not so many people protecting their own turf on this, on this task force, although I think you need that. But you need also expertise there. And I really think you need a good facilitator that will keep the group focused on what's going on. So I want to support it. If the Revenue Committee would--and I'm not criticizing anybody on the Revenue Committee--would commit some time to this, I think it's possible to bring this back out and move it this year. And I certainly wouldn't be opposed to that. I'm just not ready to vote for it, in its present form, because I'm not sure what they would accomplish. So, if we had some