

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

April 5, 2000

LB 1138

weren't there, in some instances. But if they are there, then the local governments have some higher level of responsibility to them. So if we're shifting money to counties that have poor people in them because we think that poor people require a higher level of governmental services and that we should somehow compensate for the burden that that creates for the counties, then I'm just a little bit astonished. In fact, maybe I'm more than astonished. I think that's exactly the kind of thing that we should be concerned about and be willing to do, to try to assure ourselves of that kind of equity across the state of Nebraska. If you're a poor person and you live in a poor county, does that mean you should have poor government?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Beutler, on the Wickersham amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: members of the Legislature, just on the matter of philosophy, it's not a question of helping people who need help, but the question is, how do you help them? What has been the traditional way of helping them? It's been through services provided basically by Health and Human Services. And we help everybody that needs to be helped, no matter where they are. But we help them based on their individual needs. If you start subsidizing state aid formulas, you're not helping...you're helping not only those that are in poverty there, but you're talking on the burden of helping the very rich because you're saving them the tax dollars that they would otherwise pay to the county or to the city or whoever. You can't do that, we'd go broke. I think we should stick to the traditional ways of helping people that are poor, and when you start doing this with state aid, there's less state money to help people that are poor directly because you're giving all the money out to state aid to support super...over to support infrastructures that may be entirely inappropriate. We can't ignore both sides of the equation. I think it's entirely appropriate for government to be mitigating the economic transitions that go on anywhere in this state and damage any portion of our population anywhere in this state, to mitigate those changes. But you can't permanently...you can't permanently support with government expenditures infrastructures that make no sense. It's enormously expensive and it makes no sense. There has to be another side to the equation. There has to be reorganization.