

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

May 5, 2005

LB 425

limits would certainly appreciate it. There are some counties that have several of these situations arise through part of the year. And my understanding is some of the counties have used up a lot of their funds that they get from estate funds and estate taxes that many counties use as a rainy day fund. Some of them have already depleted that because of some of the legal situations that have been involved in their counties. So I think this is a viable amendment. I think this is something that if there's any give in this budget process this would be a good place to probably look to see to fund some money. I think Senator Stuthman and Senator Bourne have come forward with something that could probably really be positive and help out in some areas and would help to reduce the property tax load in some places. I'll return the rest of my time to Senator Bourne if he so desires to have it.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Senator Bourne, would you wish to use the rest of Senator Louden's time? You have about 2 minutes and 36 seconds.

SENATOR BOURNE: Is there eight minutes left?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Oh, no.

SENATOR BOUPNE: Thank you, Madam President and members.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Two minutes and thirty-two seconds.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you. Senator Pederson, would you continue the dialogue that we had? Senator Pederson, I appreciate you answering these questions. And again, as we were talking, you mentioned that this would kind of open the floodgates. And I guess I'm trying to distinguish this that I see as an absolute obligation of the state that the state has chosen basically to disregard, versus, say, an agreement that we might have had that was a lot...on a particular set of funds, MIRF, that was a lot looser than a statutory obligation. So are you aware of anywhere else in statute that creates an obligation for the state that the state disregards in terms of funding?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Senator Pederson.