

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

February 21, 2001 LB 329

frugal and tighter-fisted and more skeptical of state government and more the enemy of government. I've never done that, and I don't have to be a conservative today, so I've got some flexibility here. The conservatives, though if I understand correctly from a lot of those votes, what they were saying, no, we got a lid but let's not really have a lid, let's have a lid with a hole in it. I'm going to hold on to my conservative status, but I want a lid that I assure have a little piece here on the side that I can get what I need to done through that back door, while at the same time claiming that I have a record of fiscal responsibility and tight-fistedness. Now see, I don't have to do that because I'm not a conservative. On the other hand, that's what happens. What we're doing here is acknowledging an escape hatch that cities have for their budget, and that budget lid says, look, occupation taxes will be here but the rest of these are restricted funds. And now that we're saying, you know, when we think about that, if we really wanted that lid to work, we'd have no funds into the restricted pot and now we're saying, oh, no, no, no, there's a back door. As a matter of fact, Senator Bromm called it flexibility. The problem is if you want flexibility, take off the lid. That's flexibility. If you want a lid, then be true to the concept of a lid which is that it works to control spending in this way. You can raise money from any way that you want to, but you can only spend a certain amount of it and if you raise money through occupation taxes...if you raise money through occupation taxes, you will stop raising as much money on property taxes. That was the whole idea. If you get money in one side, then you can put it against the costs that you do otherwise. But what you're doing what this vote says, look, we're going to get a source of revenue that won't serve to lower property taxes. We'll be able to spend it without lowering property taxes because it's not a restricted fund. If you both go tell your constituents that you're a conservative and, number two, you're fighting property taxes, then I don't see how you get to say, ah, ah, ah, ah, we'll take an escape hatch for occupation money, we'll let the city spend it without regard to what its growth is, and we won't put it into the pot by which we will lower property taxes, because that's what you're doing. I would suggest that you vote for LB 329 because it's consistent with the principle of making a lid that's real rather than a lid that's phoney-baloney. And