

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

May 23, 2005

LB 28

aspect...that holds the asset that has to come up with maintenance money and operations money, and that is a difficulty. And sometimes part of the problems we get ourselves into, especially as political subdivisions, is we accept all this money to build and to create and to have more trails, for example, and then when it comes time to fix them up, folks aren't nearly as excited about fixing things up or maintaining things as they are about building them in the first instance. And so Senator Connealy has indicated that the true purpose of this bill--and I've put an amendment up there just to further clarify that, that I don't think Senator Connealy will object to--the true purpose of this bill is, in fact, to put money into endowments, to funds that are there for the ongoing support of a community, of a building, of an institution, of a park, whatever you have. And I think it's useful to build in an incentive that creates giving to this kind of fund. So on balance, I'm...I don't think I'm going to support Senator Landis' amendment, although I would like to hear more about and I don't understand completely all of the dimensions of what he calls his preferred way of doing this. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. On with discussion on the Landis amendment, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I am persuaded by Senator Landis' argument. What Senator Connealy has to do is realize he has a bill that I don't think has a whole lot of juice. He should get what he can this year, if he can get anything. I want to strike Section 9 to get rid of that commission. I don't want the state to spend money where the net result is to find a way to reduce the state's revenue. Senator Connealy may agree to do that. If he does, I will not support the bill, I will not vote for it, but I will not fight it as hard as ordinarily I would. With that provision in, I would try to kill the bill because it makes absolutely no sense whatsoever to have a proposition like that in a bill which is being pitched as something of great value to the citizens of this state. I don't see that great value in this bill. But if there were a value, I certainly do not see that value being such that it justifies the creation of a brand new commission that's going to cost the state over \$300,000, and its purpose is to