

problem is with the Board of Regents rather than with the administrative people within the Central Administrations. However, I would suggest that this body has authorized negotiations by law some years ago. In fact I voted for the bill, LB 15, as I recall was the number, and if you want negotiations, then that is what you have got. Now if the Legislature wants to be the negotiation team for each agency and each group, you know, that is one policy, too. What we are doing in the appropriation bill, if you look on page 24 of the bill itself, there is a reappropriation of the unexpended balance for the salaries that would have been authorized by the level of appropriation last year in its increase. Those of you who are advocating, by your remarks at least indicating a higher level of funding should be negotiated, I would only call your attention that under the appropriation bill should the Board of Regents authorize a level of increase over and above and greater than what the general fund appropriation for the current year will permit, then that money would have to come out of cash funds. The fact they take it out of cash funds it will not be a part of the continuation budget for 82-83 and then the University would be back in before the Legislature next year asking for a general fund pickup in their continuation budget for the salary paid for those who are negotiating over and above the salary that was approved for the rest of the employees of the University. And I can well recall on numerous other instances where the University has made an expenditure of cash funds. In fact they did it for salaries about three years ago, as I recall, and the Legislature objected strenuously. In fact we did not pick it up. They objected strenuously to the fact that the University had gone out and paid a higher salary than was consistent with the general fund appropriation and they had used cash funds to do it. If, in fact, you want to increase the salaries then for those who are negotiating over and above what is currently appropriated and you want to provide the money to do it and you want it in the continuation budget for next year, then you are talking about a deficiency budget, a deficiency appropriation increase in the bill that we have already advanced. I assume the amendment is essentially offered for the purposes of discussing the issue but I would suggest that I don't think as a matter of public policy that the Legislature wants to get itself in the position where it is the negotiating team for every contract that may come along. So I would urge that you do not support the amendment if it is going to a vote because it creates far more complications in the long run than perhaps it appears, and secondly, I would think most importantly, if we are going to have negotiations, that means that the two teams, the two sides, whatever agency you talk about, should