

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

May 18, 2005

LB 500

with this bill. It will have limited potential users in the two years when the window is open. We know of three people who might want to use it. Cabela's, a baseball park in north Omaha, and an amusement park are the three people out there trying to make things work in a two-year time frame, to make use of this. We know that it's a bond proposal. It allows for 25 years of bonding that that money is spent for a series of development costs, which winds up being a hefty subsidy for whoever uses the bill. The bill is aimed not at normal retail, but at this expanded concept of tourism and entertainment. What I want to move away from is the motion...the thing that Senator Flood said just a moment ago. He said, you know, the last two weeks have seemed like we've been doing reconsiderations of reconsiderations of reconsiderations. And the reason is, we're getting away from majority rule. We're getting away from 25 votes. We're getting to the world where, instead of a majority body, this body, over and over again now, is either threatened or forced into not majority voting, but supermajority voting. And we do it by the use of the rules that we have. That's what's happening now. That's what was threatened in the bill before this, during the debate. If you don't do what I want you to do on this amendment, we're going to go to this extended supermajority debate again. Senator Loudon, you had a bill on prairie dogs. Didn't agree with your bill, didn't want it, didn't care for it, but you were forced to the supermajority. And I voted for that because, even though I disagree with you, if I'm not sufficiently persuasive, and if you are persuasive enough to win, that's the kind of situation that we should be able to live with. Senator Schrock, you had a motion on a constitutional amendment for language I found was irrelevant. I didn't think it was necessary; I don't think there's any threat to hunting and fishing in this body, and I wouldn't vote to do those kinds of things, as well. I was entirely in agreement with Senator Chambers that it was irrelevant. But it went to the majority...not the majority, but the supermajority, of where, as a policy, we're forced to get 33 votes instead of majority voting. It's happened over and over and over again, and it's happening on this bill, as well. We're here now, and the goal is not to persuade our colleagues that we're right or wrong; the goal is to create a blockage of time sufficient that the supermajority has to be created, and