

April 30, 1981

LB 558

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and colleagues, the amendments come under various guises, you know. There are some amendments which are designed to love the bill to death. Of course, this one does not fit in that category because the bill is going to pass. And then there are "muddy the water" amendments which get everyone so confused they don't know whether to vote for or against the bill or the amendment. But this is known as the "embarrass the Governor" amendment. I don't think that the sponsors of the amendment have demonstrated the real need for the amendment, and so I suggest that it be defeated.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I would briefly arise to defend the committee's recommendation. It was an issue that was discussed at least on two occasions that I recall, and it may have been more than that. I think the final decision on the majority of that committee would rest on two or three things, one was that the agencies involved are code departments which in a very broad sense is always part of a Governor's cabin, if you want to look at it that way...at least agencies that are directly responsible to the Governor with the exception of the Natural Resource Commission which has some separate distinction there. The other brought up philosophical issue that this body, or at least as the Appropriations Committee has talked about and this body as well for some years is what do you properly identify as a part of the cost of the operation of the office of Governor. And I think you can attach a number of definitions if you choose to in arriving at what that cost ought to be. We even discussed that issue a couple...three years ago on sunset legislation where the office of Program and Planning ought to be just put as a part of the Governor's office, or a separate agency. So discussion frequently has come up. I think the final basis, at least some of the committee felt that maybe it is appropriate from a philosophical and academic argument to rearrange the assignment of different costs of state government to a variety of agencies any number of which, I suppose, could be defended. But if we are talking about a major change in the identifiable or the appearing...the occurrence of the cost of one of the statewide elected offices, it is probably more appropriate that those substantive policy changes be made at a time when it is clearly a policy change and not one that someone would attempt to suggest was being brought about for the political reasons which I know is not the case here. But I think that if the timing for this change was made at say the end of a Governor's term, whatever, that a different kind of accountability for costs than we now have would probably