

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

April 6, 2005

LB 548

was opposed to the bill coming out of committee. The bill coming out of committee, without the committee amendment, accomplishes a goal which I would like to see, and that is it clearly sets out the fact that we'd like to limit the money that is distributed annually to \$50 million a year. The argument is actuarially we can do it, we can go to \$52 million. And some have argued that we can go to \$55 million. And later on we may be able to go to \$60 million. At some point a few years ago we had actuarial studies that showed our defined benefit plans in retirement were actuarial sound as well, but there are factors outside our control that could impact that and, depending upon other bills and other situations that may need funding, could also impact this fund, not now and not in the short term, but in the long term. That's simply my concern. So, to the extent that Senator Pederson's speech is on target, absolutely, and if we as a body want to prioritize that and continue to use the argument that he made is economic development, let's do that. Let's do that. But let's not be under the illusion or the assumption that we're somehow restoring the trust that was violated when we didn't meet the intent language in LB 692, because we're not. We're \$4 million short because for the last two years we've still been funding the research portion at \$10 million. So we should give them \$4 million in addition, and then start off at \$14 million if our goal is to keep the intent of the original bill. So we have to make a trade-off there. I'm willing to stay at the \$50 million, but I'm also willing to look at where we're spending money and prioritize it to make sure that what we're doing makes sense, that it maximizes the amount of money that we're being...that is being spent from the tobacco settlement fund annually. And if the body wants to go to \$52 million, it can go to \$52 million. If you want to go to \$60 million, if you want to go to whatever amount is actuarial sound, go for it. I'm just letting the body know the reason I voted no on the bill coming out of committee and the reason I have concerns here is not on the underlying value of the proposals or the projects, but rather on the policy decision that we're diverting from where we had set the limit prior. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Erdman. Senator Bourne.