

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

March 26, 2003 LB 117

SENATOR QUANDAHL: No. No. And actually what I guess my intent behind bringing something like this too is that if that money was ever going to leave that, it would be a corporate decision that we would all make, but it would be made primarily at, I would imagine, the behest of the Appropriations Committee.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me ask you this question. Without this amendment, what becomes of this money which belongs to persons whom the insurance companies cannot find? Where does that money rest?

SENATOR QUANDAHL: Without this money...basically the practical effect is just to close that window down to two years from five years. It would still end up with the State Treasurer in the Unclaimed Property Fund.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And since it's going to remain...how long is "in perpetuity?" How long is that? That's an indefinite period of time, which means until Jesus comes back and beyond, right?

SENATOR QUANDAHL: That's...the state has been around since 1867 so no telling how long it's going to be around.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So why do we need to shorten the period from three...five years to two years if the money is going to be in a fund eventually and it stays there in perpetuity? What is the benefit to be derived by...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...shortening that period from five years to two years? I haven't heard a compelling or even a reasonable argument for it. That's why I say you must have something that you're not telling us, or there's something those who gave you this amendment didn't tell you. So why do we have to change it from five years to two when it's not going to be of benefit to anybody by doing that?

SENATOR QUANDAHL: Is that a question you want me to...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yeah, that's a question.