

March 20, 1979

LB 412

this. I guess the Committee is not obligated to accept the motion that was made in December, but let's be honest and straightforward about it. That motion then is being ignored. The motion very clearly stated, and I can recall it, my memory is not that short, it was only December, the motion was to dissolve that office and to take those functions and put them into various other areas, because the Committee felt, at least five members felt, that those functions could be handled by other existing departments. The motion was not to change the name. It was not to make minor changes. It was to dissolve the office, and neither the Duis amendment nor the Committee amendment, nor the bill does that. I just want the full Legislature to understand exactly what at least five members, and I can check the records...I don't know what the exact vote was, but at least five members, a majority of that Committee said, we do not feel that the State Office of Programming and Planning is serving a useful function as it currently exists. We feel that it can best be done by eliminating that office and taking those functions and putting them into various different departments. Now that's what the Government Committee did in December. This is completely contrary to that vote.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Warner, do you wish to be recognized? We're technically speaking to the Duis amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes, Mr. President, I move to...or rather I mean I would rise to support Senator Duis in his proposed amendments. I also would call your attention that there was one other committee that acted prior to the Government Committee last year. The Performance Review Committee has first responsibility in doing Sunsets and in that process, and I could spend the time if we had it to go through the total process that we went through, but the recommendation of our body was not to discontinue, and the basis was this, that by the transfer that, you look at the fiscal note, the transfer of the activities that are fundamental to the operation of state government, that those are made...all you do is transfer that cost to some other agencies, you disperse responsibilities for some activities which are related, and you run additional chance because of the unique way in which some federal funds are qualified for by using SOPP, you run the additional chance of required additional general fund money in order to match some of those federal funds. I can understand that the SOPP objection essentially goes back to some zoning questions that has nothing to do with the operation of the office. It has had nothing to do with the operation of the office for at least almost two years now, and that it does serve a very unique and important