

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

March 24, 2006 LB 986, 1189

SENATOR CUDABACK: So ordered.

CLERK: Senator, AM2856, your second amendment. (Legislative Journal page 1145.)

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Thank you, Senator Cudaback, members. This is Senator Byars' amendment that he ran on the Revenue Committee package. He asked that I introduce it, and please bear with me. I really don't know all the intricacies of it. I will defer to Senator Landis, but simply, Senator Byars requested that I introduce this amendment and, Senator Cudaback, if I may, I'll just defer to Senator Landis for the opening.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Landis, you're recognized to open.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Senator Cudaback and Senator Synowiecki. In fact, I had asked for this amendment to be, not this one, but this same idea to be drafted as amendment yesterday when I learned that Senator Byars would be gone today and this bill would be up and would be subject to amendment, and it's the right location if we're going to do this piece of work. What this amendment is, is the same one that he ran on LB 986, which I resisted on two grounds, and you might recall those. Number one, the bill that he had, had never gotten out of the Revenue Committee and was in committee and had failed to advance 2-1 and 4, something like that. And the second was that we were concerned about whether or not there was a sliding slope and how far that advanced. And, in fact, that the topic had grown during the course of the green copy of the bill because we got amendments. Yesterday afternoon, upon reflection and taking a look at the sentiment of the body, the Revenue Committee met, raised the question, went back through it, looked at the language, recognized that it was limited to nonprofits in these programs, recognized that there was very little to distinguish a program done in one site and a program being done on a community basis, and concluded that the bill made some sense, advanced the bill, I think, unanimously with maybe a...with perhaps one or two abstentions, as I recall. That being the case, I asked for the amendment to be drawn, but found out that, in fact, it had been already introduced. This is an idea that the Revenue Committee has reported out. It is limited to nonprofits. It is