

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

January 23, 2003 LB 67

SENATOR RAIKES: Mr. President, members, I neglected to mention that there is an E clause also on this amendment, and that would be so that this change could be accommodated quickly so that we could proceed with the certification of state aid by February 5. Again, I urge your support. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Raikes. You've heard the closing on AM0027. The question before the body is adoption of that amendment to LB 67. All in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Voting on adoption of the Raikes amendment, AM0027, to LB 67. Voting on adoption of the Raikes amendment. Have you all voted who care to? Record please, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 30 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of Senator Raikes' amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: The Raikes amendment, AM0027, was adopted. Back to the bill itself, LB 67. Open for discussion. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, Senator Raikes, if you could look at page 30 of the bill, there's a change there that strikes me as unwise and I wanted to go over it with you and see if I'm understanding it correctly, but basically we're dealing with the provision that has to do with the total allowable General Fund budget of expenditures, Class I districts, Class I's that are associated with Class VI's, I believe. Anyway, it begins to talk about the process by which the high school district much approve or deny the request from the Class I, and it indicates that this has to be done before April 10. And then, under current law, the high school district is obligated to send written notification to the Class I of approval or denial, and if they fail to act altogether then the request is considered approved. All of that is current law. It also then goes on to say if the high school district fails to send a written notification to the Class I district of the denial of a request, then, in that instance, it's also considered approved. And it seems to me that what we're doing here is setting up what the lawyers call a "gotcha" in our process here. In other words, if I'm understanding this