

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

March 26, 2001 LB 657

to do what they should do in order to access these monies. And I'd appreciate your support of this amendment.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Mr. President, Senator Bourne raised a couple of interesting examples of conditional appropriations from the federal government that tend to tie the hands of the state, not only the state of Nebraska but other states. That's one difference between what Senator Bourne suggested and what I was suggesting to you, the federal government ties the hands of all political subdivisions in a given class. We're not requiring that all cities in the state of Nebraska have adequate sewer separation and that they keep sewage out of the basement of their constituents. We're requiring that one city do that, one city. I don't know of any instances in which the federal government has specifically required the state of Nebraska to do something to obtain a generalized appropriation of funds. There is another difference, I think, as well and I think it is an important one for us to consider as we examine, ever so briefly today perhaps, the appropriate relationship between various levels of government. Do we not chafe? Do we not suggest that those federal mandates when they come to us are inappropriate because they remove the appropriate level of discretion at the state level and that we, in general, ought to be able to figure out better what to do for the people that we represent? Now we're not hearing that message today from the city of Omaha, although I think that is normally a message that we would hear from the city of Omaha, it's certainly a message that we hear from other political subdivisions when we attempt to make decisions for them. You've removed local discretion, you've acted in a way that removes our ability to make decisions for the people who elected us to make decisions for them. Normally, we would hear that this is an unfunded mandate, wouldn't we? Wouldn't we normally hear that this is an unfunded mandate and we should not do it? To suggest, as Senator Bourne did, that we should not have appropriate parameters for the expenditure of state money in support of state programs is, I think, also an inexact portion of our discussion today. If you don't want to see state dollars expended in the most effective and efficient way that they can be, then we should not have restrictions on