

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

March 14, 2006 LB 1060

and I felt the best thing we could do on that is simply to vote on it and move it out. The amendment was presented to us without dollars. Some have spoken to that. Senator McDonald stated it very clearly. I think it is inappropriately before us. That is no judgment on the content of the thing. I am in no way trying to figure out, and I never do, the intent of somebody on this floor, the mental intention of somebody. As far as I know, it was an effort to serve for women's issues, women's health issues, and I accept that. But it's not appropriately before us. And then, again, without any judgment on anybody, but to give a little lesson on the floor here on language, Senator Foley has said several times that this is amending intent language. It is not. This is amending a statute. Intent language is often used by the committee, but we never consider amending statutes that are floating around in terms of the money item that might be connected to them. We do not do it in committee, we cannot do it in committee, we do not consider changing statute or present law in committee. Intent language is best illustrated, I think, by the masonry construction of...reconstruction of this building. We put a figure in there, and then with it we put intent language--which is nonbinding except that we're asking you to say it, too--intent language that we intend to accelerate the masonry project. That's our intent. And that has some effect on future Legislatures. It's going to add to the budget in the future years. But it's not written into law. Intent language relates to a change in dollars. And I've already stated that this particular amendment has no change in dollars. If it added \$200,000 in order to provide better healthcare for women across the state, then it would be appropriately before us, but it's not. And while I have a chance to state also, on behalf of the committee, we do not have surplus funds. We have turned down dozens of wonderful things, things that would help the state, would help health, and especially that would reduce our budgets in future years. Those are very tempting. If we had surplus funds, we would do it. But we don't have surplus funds. So even putting some money with this wouldn't have necessarily made me vote for it, because we're short on funds. But I don't consider it an appropriate item for us at this point. I will vote for reconsideration, and I will do as the first time--vote against the amendment. Thank you.