

February 20, 1996 LB 1205

the investment that would be derived from these, and that, too, then would be completed by December of '97. I should tell you that I don't know that that plan would be much different than what they testified at the hearing. In fact, I suspect it'd be almost the same, but, nevertheless, it would seem appropriate that the Legislature in 19...in 1998, when this was all completed, would be able to look at both the likely type of investment return that would be anticipated, as well as the looking at what I think would be a very massive job of the plan for the disposal of the property, and that's what the amendment does. I did not vote to put the bill out of committee. I have kind of mixed emotions on this whole issue, but it would seem to me that this would be a little more orderly if an additional year was given for the completion of that selling plan. We're in...we're in 1996, December 1 is not all that far away, it seemed to me, for what I think would be a pretty massive job of analysis for the property. I'd move adoption of the amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Warner. Discussion on the Warner amendment, Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Senator Crosby. And let me say that I think we had a very good hearing in committee on this bill. There was some interesting testimony I felt and the committee did a very good job, I think, in seeking information, questioning witnesses, testifiers, I should say, and I appreciate the committee amendment. I think it's pretty well done and it accomplishes the purpose very well. I...I don't have a big objection to Senator Warner's changing of the dates, although I don't see a compelling reason to do it, and I...and I can see some reasons for keeping the dates that the committee recommends. It's no secret the Board of Educational Lands and Funds is not supportive of this bill. That...that is obvious from the testimony at the hearing, and we would all expect that to be the case. Historically, when there has been any effort to bring about a sale of the school lands, there has been a lot of resistance from those quarters, and they do not support the bill. And so I think by having the dates proposed by the Education Committee of December 1 of '96 to have a plan, we will find out, then, before the next session what kind of plan they are going to come up with, and if there is some serious problems, we will have an opportunity in the '97 session to address those in terms of the workability of our proposal. And I, frankly, don't think, and I can't see anywhere that the