

March 21, 1996

LB 1114
LR 93

anyone even cares at this point, at this hour, whether or not that's even an issue worth to talk, talking about. So I've offered the amendment for that purpose at this time.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. You've heard the opening on the Bernard-Stevens amendment. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd rise to oppose the amendment as it says, it'll be totally state funded. (inaudible) your community colleges, that we've been dealt with, we all know for a number of times, but when we go back to LR 93, that was introduced the end of last session, which was at that time was a constitutional amendment. And at that time the amount for community colleges was at 7 cents in that particular proposal. In fact, it drops to four in the out years here, but eight now. The policy issue in part, and while Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment says it's all going to be state support, and that's one of the options. But the 1114 as it is currently drafted doesn't limit itself to that at all. We had a discussion earlier, as far as how the eight mills might be handled. But there also has been a discussion, at least I've been involved, I assume others, when talking about the community colleges, and that is that they still wanted to preserve some level of local support, some level of local property tax support that could be utilized. And that concept is still here, even at the 4 cents. There is still a level that would be available. And I believe it would be inappropriate to make the leap, at this point, that there's going to be totally state funded because there are other issues besides just the tax issue and the revenue replacement issue. But there is that other policy issue which should some portion remain with, with the local district, which gives them some flexibility to meet some of their local demands that may or may not be something that would be funded out of state revenue. So I would be opposed to the amendment because I think it forecloses, if this is to be the assumption, forecloses a number of options that I think are going to be looked at over the next two years. And it, in my opinion, at least, is premature to assume that necessarily the state's going to take over the total cost. I don't believe that is necessary, the conclusion at all, and as a matter of fact, if the proposal that was discussed earlier became an alternative it even lessen the likelihood of the state taking over the total cost. So I would urge the body to vote against. This makes a presumption which I don't believe is inherent in the bill, but