

April 4, 1979

LB 285

all of the rest of the bill and for the amendments that I have but, Senator Dworak, I believe you should withdraw your amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Dworak, we now have a chance for you to close on your amendment.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, you know I listened to the debate. I listened to the questions. I listened to the concerns and, yes, I have heard about the counties and I have heard about the cities and I have heard about the Education Service Units and I heard about the Natural Resource Districts and I have heard about the schools, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera but I haven't yet heard anybody talking about the taxpayer and that is what this thing is all about. Unfortunately he doesn't have a representative out in that rotunda. Unfortunately he doesn't have a hired gun or a paid lobbyist to come in here and put his point of view across but he is starting to talk and he is starting to talk loud and clear. We are two or three states away from a balanced budget in Washington, D.C., which may not be all bad. LB 1 has been able to stand the test of about six months and now we are starting to erode away at it and it does need some correction and I would be the first to admit it but it doesn't need a total overhaul and it doesn't need a complete change of philosophy. How do you judge enrollments? What the heck is an FTE for a Community Technical College? I dare anyone in the body to tell me. You think those figures can't be massaged, massaged to mean anything they want them to mean? If they need a 9, 10, 12, 15% budget lid, you think they can't massage those figures? You know they can. You know that possibility exists. This is a meaningless thing unless we put some kind of restriction in it on this growth and my amendment will put a reasonable restriction in it. Yes, Senator Koch, we absolutely have to have the budget increased if there is an increase in population but that does not work when there is a decrease in population. We absolutely can't live with a 1 or a 2 or a 3% growth but we absolutely can't cut if there is a 1 or a 2 or a 3% decline. Now what the heck kind of sense does that make and who are you kidding and who are you really representing? And besides, if there are those critical situations where there is increased growth as Senator Lewis' district experiences and Ralston and Bellevue, there is still a provision in here for a vote of the people. It is my understanding that these schools have never lost a bond issue when there is legitimate need; when there is legitimate growth causing legitimate hardship. What are we talking about?

2789