

February 7, 1996 LB 584

to suggest that they should pay some higher price to deliver that greater good, which is both for the rural and the urban areas. So I suggest you don't adopt this amendment. If Senator Coordsen wants to present an amendment that would make it 50-50 instead of putting the entire burden on the public, that's fine. And that was my suggestion, and that was rejected by Senator Coordsen. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Madam Chairman and members of the body, I rise to support Senator Coordsen on this deal. I do remember years past the railroads did pay for cattle losses. I think it needs to stay that it will be 100 percent responsibility of the rails or the Game and Parks Commission because I think it goes a little deeper. I think it reflects a liability issue. I think that landowners along there, a few cattle there, we're going to have people that can taunt livestock, and if the fences aren't up they're going to say it was the owner's responsibility, and I think that that's not fair. And I also think Senator Beutler is not quite right when he said this is an abandoned railroad, because I think if it was an abandoned railroad it reverts back to the property owners and we wouldn't have this discussion. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Klein. Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Madam President. Aren't we having fun on a Wednesday morning? Senator Beutler, as always you're almost right. However, when you go out into the countryside and you look at where a railroad corridor goes, where does a railroad corridor go? Whether it's an active track, or whether it's a rail bank track that's being converted to recreational purposes, it goes in one of two places, either between a highway, a road and private property, or it bisects, in some manner, private property. Okay? So when we talk about fair, if the railroad ceased to exist, the landowner whose property is being divided by that railroad, if it is tillable land that they farm, for the most part, they would level the land off and farm it and there would be no need for a fence. If it divides pastureland, the rancher would take the fence down and make that one pasture and eliminate that many miles of fence. So there's nothing in this for the landowner. There's nothing in this for the landowner other than being given the opportunity, out of