

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

April 7, 2004

LB 619, 692, 916

the graciousness of the natural resources district, that was also amended into LB 619 and did pass Final Reading and was signed by the Governor, as Senator Bromm stated. So this bill is still sitting there on Select File and the provisions of it already enacted into law. So at this point to strike those original sections wouldn't hurt anything, and we have an opportunity in doing so to actually help our state. And I think any time we identify sections of statute that are, one, unclear and, two, perhaps outdated at best and perhaps financially impacting us, then I think when it comes to our attention and we have an opportunity to do something it's incumbent upon us to take the steps to do that. And although it's getting on an evening we did have scheduled to be here, I think this is an appropriate use of our time. I'm not going to spend any other times talking on it. I will be happy to answer any questions, if anybody has any. And I didn't mean to be flip with Senator Chambers' question but I took it in the spirit that I thought it was asked. And so I support the amendment to suspend the germaneness rule and I support what Senator Bromm is attempting to do with the underlying amendment, and I'll speak on that now as well, and then I won't be speaking on it anymore, because I'll be working to finish up LB 916, which I think we're getting close to agreement on, and I'll say that on the mike so everybody is aware that that's where we are. But I need to go out and talk to three people and see where we are with some final amendments, and the "Three Musketeers" in the Rotunda have been very gracious in working on it, and that may be a matter of coming to some agreement on the floor and not take up a whole lot of time. But back to this subject, before I get out there to discuss it with them, I think that there is other potential litigation, just as Senator Bromm said, that comes along. My view of this is that it's not special legislation; that it isn't dealing with just one particular potential lawsuit. It can be for any future lawsuit and it makes no sense, to me, to allow to remain in statute an interest rate that has not been in place for years, and, in fact, I'd love to get 10 percent on an investment right now. So, for any potential water rights litigation, there could be things that we're not even thinking about that would come along, including the Universal Service Fund that I think Senator Bromm also mentioned, I think this is just good policy. I think it's an appropriate time, because