

May 6, 1981

LB 557

we never have. It is always we have to override vetoes, we have to override vetoes to get any money for state aid. The system that I am offering you would prevent any tax increase. It would make the thing pretty much veto proof. And, I think it would recognize the priorities such as the water thing that Senator Kremer and Schmit put on, the state aid, at least half of it that was put on to keep up with inflation and that part of the financing system. I urge you to adopt it and I know that there are less count 29 votes absolutely against it without any understanding of what it is I am offering, but the University has sent out the magic word so I know that it is fate, but I think I did have to offer it because I think in future years, in future years you are going to see you have got competing forces and you have to start treating them more fairly and equally than we have in the past and you cannot have the University as the only thing that attention is given to.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think it has been indicated by the maker of the motion that the argument be presented all on this bill. I'll merely point out that LB 557 has no General Fund money in it. It is the cash funded agencies only. But since we are only arguing the principle we can argue it here as well as any place. It was suggested that the committee ties up all money and that is not true. Has not been true since I have been on the Appropriations Committee and this year you will recall the yellow sheet showed 8.7 million. Half of that was for reduced revenues should the food credit be increased but there was funds left over. I want to talk more specifically about the concept because that is really what is at issue. The first concept is that we are cutting state fund operations, as I understand the proposal to increase aid. That is a priority that I personally can not support, that the state gives a lesser priority to its prime responsibilities for programs where it has the sole responsibility for programs as compared to the aid bills. Secondly, it has been stated that this will not affect salaries, across the board 2% and again as a technical fact that is probably an untrue statement because as I understand the amendment as it is proposed is to cut all programs....agencies but 2% well you will have programs within particularly smaller agencies that are highly salary or personal service intensive, and there is frankly not that kind of funds.

4600