

April 4, 1979

LB 285

PRESIDENT: Do you want to take it up?

SPEAKER MARVEL: Well let's take it up.

PRESIDENT: All right. Read the motion.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator DeCamp moves to repeal all provisions of LB 1 as passed in our special session of last year.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this is really the only alternative that has not been considered with respect to the lid bill. I will give my arguments in about four minutes. I don't think the lid bill as it is now, as it has been in the past, as it must necessarily function in the future, addresses the real problem. Poll after poll, campaign after campaign stated the primary purpose and need of this legislative session is to address the property tax problem, the unfairness in equalization, the whole issue there. The lid bill doesn't do one thing, hasn't done one thing to straighten that mess out. What does the lid bill do? As it functions it locks in inequities and functions unconstitutionally. Example: A school district that is spending \$2,000 per student is promised, guaranteed, by law allowed under this proposal, under our lid bills, to increase their per student amount at \$14 a year per student. The school district that has been economizing, that has been doing things, let's say, excessively right and only spending \$1,000 per student, can only increase by \$7 per student per year. The bill has the concept of a guaranteed increase built into it, an inflation psychology, the whole lid concept, inflation psychology. We have got to increase but we can only increase so much. We have got to increase. Legitimate needs will be met and legitimate growth will be met by the local people in a responsible way. If they need additional money they will have a vote. Who stated that? Not me. Senator Donny Dworak, in giving his needs for the lid bill said, legitimate needs in a community the people will respond to. The lid in Colorado that we were all exalting so much not so long ago has been declared unconstitutional because of the very concepts I have brought up. In other words, it treats different entities unfairly. It says, one that has been a profligate, one that has been squandering money and built up huge needs or huge expenses. They are now locked into that higher level and allowed to increase on that base. Those that have been economizing are locked into the lower one. It is just exactly the opposite of the concept