

SENATOR SMITH: Okay, I guess my concern, Senator Schmit, is that if we hadn't had a bill I would have probably been very willing, at this point, based on the fact it probably isn't going to be resolved for some months, been willing to support your motion on the floor to save that funding. But since we are now dealing with it as an issue for repeal, at the same time, it's become an issue for me as a member of the Public Works Committee and as someone who supported this piece of legislation, because I feel that in the end this is the responsible thing to do for the state. So, I guess I won't be able to support this right now then. Thank you.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Thank you, Senator Smith. Senator DeCamp, please.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, like Patrick Henry, or whoever, I will defend to my death LB 835, and I shall. I think LB 835 is most important and very progressive deregulation legislation, and I believe it has successor legislation coming that will complete the process of deregulation. With that said, I will also go on and say, and I'm voting for this amendment. There is no problem. You may remember, I said there was no money necessary in the first place for LB 835. LB 835 is deregulation. You may remember the origins, I repeat the origins of the fiscal note. When the bill got moving and about Final Reading they walked in and said, oh gosh, we can't stop it any other way so we use that ultimate trick, the fraudulent, if you would, fiscal note saying it costs an extra million dollars or whatever and hope that that stymies the bill at the last. Well, without even breaking to pause, Senator Warner threw an A bill in and we just marched in and appropriated another, what, couple hundred thousand and then I guess, what, three, four hundred thousand for the next year. I say that money is as unnecessary as anything. It was never intended to be part of the bill. Information from every source said it was not necessary. So, all I am doing, by supporting the amendment, is sticking to my original premise, and that is the A bill was fraudulent from the start, was unnecessary, and this is money available for other purposes. Maybe that money you didn't take out of, what, Commission on the Status of Women, or whatever, you can make it up here. So, I say the court case has absolutely no bearing on the money. The court case, if it decides the bill is unconstitutional, fine, I don't think it will, but if it decides the bill is constitutional, which it will, if it decides the bill is constitutional there is no need