

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

May 28, 2003

LB 622

budgetary requirement. The \$296,000 is money that you can absolutely guarantee will be spent. It is money that comes from the state. There's no required match. It will be spent. So be careful of arguments that if you do something like this you are in fact going to raise local property taxes. I can't tell you that there's no instance ever, but I'm saying in the important cases it looks to me like that does not happen. A next point. Is this...would this, for example,...and I use Omaha just as an example. Would this be a major financial blow to the city of Omaha? The city of Omaha I think has \$228 million, roughly, of budget. This amounts to two-tenths of one percent of their budget. So when you talk about 30 percent cuts and so on and so forth, keep in mind that state aid as a component of...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...resources to a city is...excuse me?

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute,...

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: ...Senator Raikes.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...is a very small part of their overall resources. So the argument that this is going to create extreme financial hardship simply doesn't hold. That simply isn't the case. More than likely, what we're really talking about here is, this is a case where it's not real money to cities. It is, in lots of instances, free money that will be spent, because there's no strings on it. On the other hand, particularly in this fiscal crisis that we're in, it is real money to the state. So again, I urge you to stand firm and not support the motion to return. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Landis, on the motion to return.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, there is a distinction. And by the way, I was educated by this argument and this process over time. I think I might of