

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

March 22, 2004 LB 1093

to bring in jeopardy the ability of the state to...or the ability of the school systems, rather, to deal with that challenge they face. Let me mention one other thing. I think I've heard some people make the comment that, well, look, school boards and citizens in local school districts really need to take up this issue themselves, so I'm going to vote against this because I think if school districts want to have a good educational system then they should impose the levy on themselves. In this context, that reasoning is exactly backward. If you want to do that, you would vote for this amendment, not against it. If you vote against this amendment, what that means is that there's going to be more state money supplied to schools and thereby, potentially, at least, less local money. So keep in mind that distinction. The other thing I'll mention is that recertification, recertification is certainly a possibility. But my own view is that it is much more prudent to head into the recertification with the possibility at least of having a happy recertification rather than a dismal one. A happy one would be that, look, we had intended that the property tax would have to be \$1.10, but we see now that because of a better fiscal situation at the state level that can be only a dollar or the levy lid needs only be \$1.05 versus the one that we really had no reason to believe that we could maintain or lower the levy lid, but we sort of hoped that we could. And now we come to the situation where we realize that our hopes are not reality so we're going to have to deliver some very negative news in the way of a recertification; namely, that state aid is going to be much reduced and the local property tax burden much increased. One other point, Senator Brashear offered some interesting ideas.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR RAIKES: My own view is I have caution. Suppose we had done that or gone into a program where we borrow money three or four years ago. I think we have to be very careful about that. I could, I think, support that sort of a notion for funding a potential judgment in the low-level nuclear waste suit. In terms of operation of state government, funding of schools, I am much less inclined to do so. I think that we need to face up with our usual pay as you go funding basis, take care of the