

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

May 25, 2005

LB 478

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Further discussion on the Cornett amendment, AM1690. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator, I assume this is an amendment to Senator Cornett's amendment?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

CLERK: Is this how you want to characterize it? Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to amend Senator Cornett's amendment. (FA305, Legislative Journal page 1776.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, to open on your amendment to the Cornett amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And Mr. President and Mr. Clerk, I was in the process of discussing, and I didn't realize nobody would be speaking, so I had to put that down. Here's what my amendment would do. And it shows again that merely because language appears in an executive order signed by a President, that it makes sense or that it's correctly done. You all buy it, because the President signed it. Let's read this language as it exists: "by the taxpayer who by nature of his or her duties." "By nature." What they meant to say was "by virtue of his or her duties," not "by nature of." It's like sometimes people say, because they hear it, "in the essence of time." What they mean is "in the interest of time." What my amendment would do...and I don't care if you accept it or not, because I'm taking time. It would say, "by the taxpayer who by virtue of his or her duties." Because, it is because of that which entitles the taxpayer, based on that and other circumstances, to participate in this boondoggle. I have another version, which would, instead of striking "by nature," it would strike the word "by" and insert the words "due to the." And if you wanted that version, it would say, "by the taxpayer who due to the nature of his or her duties" must meet these eligibility requirements. But I'm going to run with the one that's up there, because I want to defeat this bill, no matter what form it's in. But I wanted this opportunity to show that simply taking language from an executive order does not mean that it says what it ought to say. I acknowledge, I could be reading it incorrectly. And