

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

May 17, 2005

LB 312

distressed areas, leaving those wage levels exactly as Senator Landis has proposed them in the first instance. So that's what the bill does. And I would recommend that for your consideration.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. You've heard the opening on the Beutler amendment, AM1623, to LB 312. Open for discussion. Senator Landis, followed by Senator Kruse.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I believe the order of events for the morning is something like this. There are, I believe, three Beutler amendments that make adjustments to the bill. Senator Connealy has an amendment which I think he'll ask to substitute for the working draft of technical amendments that we've been working on since General File, amendments that don't cost any money, and make the bill work better, in the sense that it achieves the objectives that it has. Senator Preister has a bill that has to do, I believe, with discrimination in environmental law compliance. I think that's right. Senator Synowiecki has an amendment that has to do with health benefits and wages. Senator Redfield will have an amendment that has to do with the investment-only tier and whether or not it's applicable where there's a job loss. Senator Raikes will have an amendment that says the manufacturing sales tax exemption should come out. And Senator Chambers has 15 amendments that strike the bill one section at a time. That's the morning. And I've also been approached about trying to put in another bill from another...that's been reported out of the Revenue Committee, that's a Speaker committee priority. It is without malice that I'm going to wind up either not voting, or voting no, depending on where...or just not voting to make significant alterations at this point. I'm going to put it in technical shape. I'm going to support the Connealy amendment when it comes up. But generally speaking, the bill...I'm going to vote either "not voting" or "no" on changes, not that they shouldn't be considered, taken to a vote. And if the body wants to do it, great. Go ahead and make changes as you will, if you think it's appropriate, if you're persuaded by it. I understand. I must say that my die is cast, that the terms and provisions that I've worked on in the bill are ones that have some interdependence. But I speak only for