

February 6, 1973

(Start of Belt #11)

all other schools are going to want six and then in the future somebody is going to make it eight and ten and twelve and pretty soon we have eliminated the right of people to express themselves as to what they want to spend their money for. Now, irrespective of what the sponsor of this bill says or what the intent is, it is what the bill allows them to do. Now it is like the Federal government, they build post offices under a lease option and that is what this bill provides, a lease option for school buildings and when the Federal government runs out of money, they say, well, we'll build it without an appropriation but we'll just pay the rent and advertise it, which is a good way to get away from public responsibility. Now if the people in these areas don't want school, they ought to be able to say no and they shouldn't be in a position of us extracting from them without their knowledge or consent which maybe, otherwise, we would not be permitted to do. Now if you want to confine the bill to equipment, that's one thing. If you want to expand it to equipment and buildings, that's another thing. There is no reason in the city of Omaha why they couldn't build a school for \$25,000,000. This bill says they can. The limitation is only time. In order to extend the time, they could make the payments small for the first twenty years and on the twentieth year they just balloon the balance. When you get into the area of issuing bonds, you get into an area of a lot of finagling of bond people who are interested in making a fee, which is normal for the course, which they have a right to do. Well, I think in any case, at least in any school district outside of that in Omaha, this bill has no merits. Now if Omaha wants to have their Senators here bring about these bills, that's their problem and you've got enough Senators in Omaha to be responsible to the people of Douglas County, the city of Omaha, and the school district and they can accept or retaliate against them and really in this case, I do not care what Omaha does in so far as their public schools are concerned and if you want to make the bill effective only to the Class of schools that are in Omaha, go your best. Eliminate the years, eliminate any restrictions at all because that's good with me but in the Scottsbluff school district, no. So, I move for the adoption of the amendment which would limit the bill only to equipment in every area of its application.

SPEAKER: The chair recognizes Senator Stahmer. We are speaking on the Carpenter amendment to LB 197. Senator Stahmer, Keyes, Lewis, Nore, Kelly, and Dickinson unless your lights go off.

SENATOR STAHMER: I would like to speak against the Carpenter amendment. I'd like to point out that Senator Carpenter, he wasn't here when there was a great deal of discussion about LB 10. He was out of the city doing good work for us so he had a very legitimate absence. But I'd like to point out to Senator Carpenter that our Constitution requires that we make children go to school. I don't know of any city in the state where they are going to school in shacks and old buildings and firetraps as they are in Omaha. Now, I don't think those of us in Omaha, I think I can speak for Senator Syas as well as myself and some others, we're not interested in forcing any buildings to be built anyplace. We, and certainly I, am very much concerned about the nature and condition of some of the buildings we're forcing our children to attend. It seems strange to me that on one hand we have largess with our funds when it comes to lease purchasing field houses in the state and lease purchasing state office buildings but when it comes to building school buildings to meet the requirements of the Constitution suddenly great problems arise. I'd like to point out once and for all the Constitution requires these children to go to school and I don't think there is a district in the state that has their children attending the type of poor,