

March 23, 1982

LB 942

I will add that as we add, or we aren't adding the money yet, by the way, you have got to put the money in the appropriation bill, but as we change the law that would reduce the impact on the general fund, I can appreciate that each \$40 or \$2700 or \$80,000 in itself is not all that big a deal except the cumulative consequences of all these adds are going to have a significant impact that you are going to have to reckon with. I will go one step further to suggest that we may well be making further rounds of reductions, at least based on what I notice in the receipts daily. We do not seem to be doing very well in the receipts side and they could deteriorate further I assume and it is almost...well, you are going to have the same frustration the Appropriations Committee has had since January where we numerous times have set a budget and then found we had to cut and I rather suspect you may find that again this year after we get it here on the floor, and if we do, it is not going to be nearly as hard if we do not keep adding all the time. So I would agree there is merit to the arguments that are offered by those who are proposing the amendment but unfortunately there is not the money. And I think it is not unreasonable that parents would have some portion of co-pay for that transportation.

SENATOR LAMB: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, I just think Senator Warner needs a little moral support. The past three or four years I have been on the Appropriations Committee, it used to be a heck of a lot of fun, you know, as trying to decide what project we spent the money for and it was always exciting when you had one project you personally preferred over another project, whether that be a theater arts building or a chiller or a historical society or a gym in Chadron or whatever it is. Well, I want to tell you, Senator Sleck and Senator Vickers, that this year it has been a little different. It is how much can you take out of what program and I don't think any programs have been immuned from this shift. You know we came out of that committee with a pretty tight budget at \$763 million. I think at that point Fowler left and wouldn't even come back for the next round of cuts down to \$742 million but it was gruesome and the \$740 million level where we are right now is still contingent upon an increase in the personal income tax, a corporate increase, a cigarette tax being passed. That is to make the \$740 million. Now yesterday and now starting again today it seems to be pretty easy for this body to just crumble and put this stuff back in. Now, granted, there is nothing extremely significant with \$80,000 when you are talking \$740 million but they all add up and the package that was put together by the Appropriations