

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

April 1, 2004 LB 1090, 1093

before they make a move, and when everything is calm they're paralyzed and cannot move at all? But if we don't do anything here, then I'm going to try to kill LB 1093. Now, I don't know how Senator Raikes feels about cloture, so the next time I'm recognized I will have to explore that area with him. Thank you, Madam President.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Erdman, you're recognized to speak.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature. The amendment that's before us, if that's what we are to be discussing, strikes some language on page 2 which would say that the allocation of the money within the Highway Trust Fund remain unaltered as a result of the transfers required by such sections. We were unsuccessful in striking the language as far as the previous language on page 1 that has "substantial" in it, but I think it's important that we as a body understand that what's in the underlying amendment does substantially alter the existing payments to different entities, and the example is the Highway Allocation Fund. Senator Baker has talked about this and I think the reason that I want to confirm that or bring that up again is if you look at the difference between what is going to be paid under this amendment versus what those entities that Senator Stuthman spoke of, what the difference is as far as a percentage, it's 17.5 percent less. That's substantially different, in the general sense of the word. So we're not even talking about being close or substantially close. You know, that's almost 20 percent. That's one-fifth. So I think there's more to this and I think we need to have that discussion. I think it's important for us to read what's in the amendment to understand, if possible, how the transfers happen from the Highway Trust Fund to a Cash Reserve Fund, then to a Judgment Fund, and then how that is all taken care of. So as I'm reading this, I'm trying to understand it, but I do rise in support of Senator Chambers' amendment. I was in support of his previous amendment and I think it's important that if we're going to do this amendment that we do it in a way that it doesn't hamstring those entities that are relying on the state for funds. The other thing that I wanted to do is to yield my time to Senator Bromm. He had requested