

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

April 20, 2005      LB 673A, 673

CLERK:      Senator, then...may I then construe your FA174 as an amendment to Senator Pederson's?

SENATOR CHAMBERS:    Yes.

CLERK:      All right.      Mr. President, in that event, Senator Chambers would move to amend Senator Pederson's amendment with FA174.    (Legislative Journal page 1240.)

SENATOR CUDABACK:    Senator Chambers, you're recognized to open on FA174.

SENATOR CHAMBERS:    Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I had to craft it in the way that I did, because I did not know whether Senator Don Pederson's amendment would be adopted, which reduced the \$100,000 to the mere pittance of \$25,000.    So my amendment would strike all of the language that relates to that. Here is how it would go, if you have any interest. But even if you don't, the record should be clear. On page 2 in line 2, strike beginning with the first appearance of the word "the" through the number "27" in line 4. These are the words that would be stricken: "the General Fund for FY 2005-06 and (2) \$100,000 from the General Fund for FY 2006-07 to the Department of Agriculture for Program 27." What that would read, with my amendment, is "There is hereby appropriated \$100,000 from the Rural Development Trust Fund to aid in carrying out the provisions of LB 673," et cetera. This is a rural problem. The rural trust fund deals with rural issues. My amendment is in the nature of a compromise. It would give the \$100,000, but it would take it from a fund set aside to deal with rural issues. Senator Stuthman had talked about the loss of assessment valuation of certain land where prairie dogs have operated. Senator Louden has talked about the reduction in income-producing power of land where prairie dogs live. If money and income are what people are concerned about, rural development certainly would be a term that would embrace those notions. What more logical, reasonable place from which to take money to deal with a rural problem, than the Rural Development Trust Fund? This amendment gives an opportunity to see just where people are, and what it is they want to see done; finally and most importantly, who should pay for it? I'd like to ask