

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

May 8, 2003

LB 540

bottom line what we contribute to schools. My one problem with Senator Raikes' LB 540, and again I'm going to support LB 540 regardless of what happens to this amendment. I think it's a good piece of legislation. But we haven't controlled costs. We've simply said those...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BOURNE: ...needs or costs are lower. Just because we say that it's 0 percent increase doesn't mean, in the real world, that it is. And all my amendment does, again, is allow us to track what those needs would have been but for our adoption of LB 540. So again, I appreciate the debate. There's a lot of confusion. I appreciate Senator Maxwell bringing up his idea to kind of revamp state aid to spending. But I do want to point out that this amendment doesn't really have anything to do with a total revision of state aid as advocated for by Senator Maxwell. And I appreciate the discussion on that issue on this amendment. But again, my amendment doesn't go towards revamping the state aid formula. It just simply allows us to track what those needs would have been if we had not adopted LB 540. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bourne and Senator Connealy. Senator Raikes, and this will be your third time, Senator.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I can be brief, I think. First, one point that I neglected to mention and should have is that this amendment, if enacted, would not affect school spending ability at all. It would simply affect the amount of money the state would be on the line to provide for state aid. We've always kept, as I mentioned before, needs calculation and budget authority together. This would separate them, I think another good reason not to do it. The way it is right now in the first year of the out biennium, state aid would increase by \$149 million or 24.2 percent. That's without this amendment. If this amendment would be added, you'd bring that up to \$200 million. We put four years of numbers on the fiscal status for a reason. You don't balance the first two years without paying any attention in the out years. And I think one