

April 10, 1979

LB 587

you are going to like in terms of the University expending the dollar levels that they want to, and then coming back to this Legislature and say, now listen we did this and the courts have told us we can do this, and stick their chest out to us and say, we have autonomy...

SPEAKER MARVEL: You've got about 15 seconds, Senator Lewis.

SENATOR LEWIS: Well it won't take much longer than that, Mr. President....that's not the way I want to do business, and I think that ought to be clear and I think that speaks for a number of members of this Legislature.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Kremer, and then Senator Warner and Senator Simon, and Senator Dworak. Senator Kremer.

SENATOR KREMER: Mr. Chairman, mine is on the bill. We're talking about the amendment, are we not at the present? Mine is on the bill proper.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Warner, do you wish to speak to the amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Just briefly, Mr. President, in opposition and only to state that the comments relative to this 460,000, which incidentally comes out of the bill to be 485,000 because of the adjustment of last year's dollar amount for inflation, but this particular amount was not a part of the salary discussion that most of the remarks have been directed toward. This particular use of funds were in the revolving funds of the University and you could make the argument and not be incorrect that in the processing of the appropriation bill last year, that they had an underestimate of the level of revolving funds, it was the cause of the use of these available cash funds on a one-time basis, and we tend to look on this particular amount as that they did use cash funds but they were cash funds available on a one-time basis and, in fact, also picked up the costs that would appropriately have been general fund last year had we not determined the budget on the basis that we did. I would oppose Senator Newell's amendment on this particular program.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Simon.

SENATOR SIMON: Senator Warner, I have a question or two if you will yield, please? I understand the rationale I think as far as the fact that the money from last year was underestimated.