

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

January 9, 2006 LB 542

dealing with. If you read through it as I have read through it, and I'm sure others have not and will not, this language should not go into the statute books of this state. There has to be somebody, there ought to be "somebodies," concerned about the integrity of the statutes, the language used to express ideas, and the ideas expressed. When words are put into a law and they carry no meaning to the mind of the reader, those words should not be there. It's one thing to take a proposal when it's being put together and dump everything imaginable into it, then winnow out those things that ought not to be there. We are now at a point of being asked to advance this proposal in the form it appears. Senator Burling cannot explain what this language means. Senator Stuthman got a lot of help from me, through my speculation about what the language might mean. But somebody who has not had the benefit, or the disadvantage, of my and Senator Stuthman's discussion and Senator Burling's attempt to explain this language would have no idea of what this means. They have not made it clear what "the fundamentals" of the economy are. People speculate based on other notions they have. Are the fundamentals of the economy...it doesn't say what they are. Would one of the fundamentals be the work force? Would all of the fundamentals be encompassed in the two words "employers" and "employees"? Those are the fundamentals of an economy. Would capital be a fundamental of the economy? When workers are paid an inadequate amount, are they at one and the same time capital and labor? By being cheated out of a fair wage, their very presence there working is amassing more capital for the gouging, unfair employer. Is that what this is talking about? Who knows. This is not language worthy...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...of a deliberative body. I can understand why those who signed on it are sitting around here like knots on logs, not saying anything, holding a low profile and hoping I don't single them out and ask them questions. They don't volunteer anything. If this proposal is going to create or facilitate the creation of a more fair, equitable, and efficient tax structure during the session which is devoted to cutting taxes, why won't those whose names are on it stand up and speak for it and defend it? Why won't all the tax cutters who have