March 31, 1981

LB 284

SENATOR CARSTEN: Okay then, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I move the committee amendment number 1, 3, 4 and 5.

SPEAKER MARVEL: On page 766 of the Journal, item, LB 284.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Right.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, Senator Kahle, your light is on. Oh, we are now speaking to the adoption of the amendment as explained by Senator Carsten. All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment vote aye, opposed vote no. Record the vote.

CLERK: 33 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of committee amendments 1, 3, 4 and 5.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, that portion of the amendment is approved, is adopted. Senator Carsten.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Now, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I move for the adoption of number 2 of those same amendments.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, Senator Kahle, do you wish to speak to that motion?

SENATOR KAHLE: Yes, Mr. President. Ever since we have had the controversy or the problem with what was LB 882 and it became unconstitutional, of course. It was declared unconstitutional. One of the things that I was asked as all of you know, the first payment should have gone out in December and the flak that I got in the first part of the legislative session was that, well, we, as some, especially school districts who get a big chunk of the money, that we can get by without the money but if we had had this money in our possession we would have it out on interest and of course the other side of that is if those subdivisions had to borrow money, they also had to pay interest. So one of the things that I found out early in this process was that we could help salve the feelings of those people that did not get the money when they thought they would by allowing them to collect interest on it. Now, Senator Marsh tells me that the state is going to be short a couple million dollars if we pay this interest. This boggles my mind because that fund was never the state's or never the Appropriations Committee. It was in the state treasury but it was earmarked money for specific purpose and even though it was declared unconstitutional it did not free the money up for the state to use as they would want to and it certainly did not relieve them of being responsible for the interest that would be accumulated. So, I strongly