

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

June 1, 2005

LB 645

money has to be appropriated from a specific fund, and the money has to be done through language of appropriation. If we are taking the position that we can appropriate money in this fashion, we ought to do away with A bills because that is a waste of time. It is a waste of money and, from now on, any bill that calls for the expenditure of money should carry the appropriation language in the bill. And such being the case, I pledge to fight every appropriation bill that comes through from now on. It's a wasted, unnecessary step. When you have the appropriation in the bill itself, everybody knows precisely what it is that we're dealing with. I'd like to ask Senator Don Pederson a question.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Pederson, would you respond?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Yes, I will.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Pederson, if all of this research that we're being told has been done which says that in positive legislation, such as this, appropriations can be made, isn't the drafting and handling of A bills for specific bills an unnecessary and wasted second step?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: It would seem to be so. May I make a comment, Senator Chambers?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Sure.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: I have just spoken with the Fiscal Office representatives here, Mr. Bergquist, and he has informed me that this has been done on numerous occasions before when, in the last five days of the legislative session, there is not time to formulate and approve an A bill, and that this has not previously been challenged.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But we don't...challenged by whom?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Challenged by...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: In court or...