

May 9, 1991

LB 843

be there to take in some of the inmates. Obviously, that hole...if you do that, you just get in a deeper hole as far as (interruption).

SENATOR SMITH: I agree totally because we put some money into the program expansion because of the requirement that we do that.

SENATOR MOORE: And, obviously, that's the argument why you would not want to cut Corrections. It is our understanding now we've backed it down to a 2 percent cut. In some initial conversation, it sounds like the Corrections would not close the Hastings facility, but there may, indeed, be some other items they would close. But that was just something we backed down to 2 percent just about two weeks ago.

SENATOR SMITH: All right, I wanted to have that in the record. Thanks very much.

SPEAKER BAACK: Time. The next speaker is Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senator Moore, would you yield to a question?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, I would, Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Looking at the committee amendments on page 118, it has to do with the State Historical Society. At the top of the page it says it is the intent of the Legislature that funding of the operation of the branch facilities be maintained at least at the 1991...1990-91 expenditure level each year for the 1991 through '93 biennium. How much strength will that have with the Historical Society? Are they bound then by that?

SENATOR MOORE: Well, obviously, there is a pending lawsuit on whether or not the State Historical Society is, indeed, a state agency, so I...kind of like the board, I guess there was some question that if they are, indeed, not a state agency, as with the bones issue, we can cope with many things. But I would argue that the intent language is very clear by the Appropriations Committee, to begin with, and now if the Legislature adopts it, I would think the State Historical Society would be...I would go beyond the words unwise to ignore