

February 20, 1996 LB 1205

is put into an investment fund that has a variety of common stocks, commercial real estate and also some agricultural real estate. There is simply no responsible investment advisors in this state or elsewhere who would tell you that the investment fund for the children ought to be so heavily involved in agricultural land, it just doesn't make sense for the children of Nebraska and it's time we changed it. And that has nothing to do with the desire of certain landowners out there for the property. If it's sold over a long enough period of time, it can be sold at fair market value, and it ought to be sold at fair market value, and it ought to be reinvested. And if it's managed, remember, through the State Management Fund, not only will the investment be diversified and thereby improved and stabilized and better protected, but it also will not require nearly as much money to administer the fund. I don't know, I'm sure Senator Bromm has the figures. I don't know what the current figures are in terms of how much it costs to administer educational lands and funds, but obviously it costs a lot of money to get involved in individual leases and...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...bid processes and to do everything they do to administer this fund. That in and of itself is a reason and an area of savings that we should be looking at. And so I would challenge anyone to describe how it's possible for a diversified fund invested in accordance with trust company, financial fiduciary responsibility standards, how any such fund could justify so much agricultural land in it. It's just...it's just not...it's just not possible. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Mr. Clerk. Senator Warner wants to divide the amendment?

CLERK: Madam President, Senator Warner, you want to...you wish to divide your amendment?

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, I was listening to the discussion. I know you don't have a handout, but it was such a simple amendment. Most of the discussion has either been with the dates, which moves everything back one year. I'd like to ask to separate that, but take up first the provision that the