

February 20, 1996 LB 1205

taxes that come from that land. In lieu of taxes is paid to the school districts from that land. It's possible that they don't get tax in some of the other...in some of the other subdivisions, but there are taxes paid on that land. I was talking to a man this morning who has a section of school land beside a section of land that he owns, both the same kind of land, and he said that the taxes on the school land, the in lieu of taxes on the school land brings in more dollars than the taxes on his own land. So I think that there's...I don't think there is that inequity that other farmers and ranchers might think exist. So I will support Senator Warner's motion to delay this for a year, and then I am not even sure I'll support the bill. Thank you.

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

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Crosby, members of the Legislature, we have kind of gotten off the Warner amendment, and so I decided I should just go ahead and speak now. I'm not really speaking to the Warner amendment. I don't think that the Warner amendment is something that I think reasonable people can take different sides on. I do want to state very strongly, though, that...that I believe the evidence is clear that if this money were taken and invested and managed in accordance with best management practices that there would be a lot more money for the children of Nebraska, and that's why I'm in favor of this bill. Obviously, I don't have any of this property in my district. My only interest in it is what good does this do for education. Just to give you a flavor of the nature of the testimony at this particular time, we asked the counsel for Educational Lands and Funds if he really thought, in his own opinion, that having such a large percentage of the investment in agricultural land made any sort of fiduciary sense, made any sort of investment sense, and even that person, who understand is defending as best he can the current system, said not more than half of the funds should be in agricultural land. Well, it's way above half now. And his opinion, notwithstanding the fiduciary responsibility rules followed by almost all trust officers investing private funds would have a very small percentage of a total investment pool in agricultural land. That would be what would be considered financially responsible for investing the funds of another person. I submit to you, notwithstanding the figures that Senator Dierks was alluding to, that the return on investment overall will be much greater if the lands are sold and the money