

May 8, 1979

LB 594

concern of the impact a year from now and the ability of the state to stay within the 7% limit for the 80-81 appropriation and I sent to you a couple of weeks ago a kind of a rough estimate of what one could anticipate in the way of necessary expenditures and the amount of available funds if the body wishes to stay within 7% next time, and obviously, the obligations that we incur this session which must be funded a year from now will have an impact upon what we can do. I made the same argument on LB 138 and to be absolutely factual with you I would support rekeeping what is in the capital construction bill before I would support 138 and for the reason that I do believe strongly that state revenues should be used for state purposes first before we begin to share them with local government. So what the amendment does, it removes from the, and the amendment itself will be controversial, it removes from the appropriation bill the total appropriation for the Ag Engineering Building, the total appropriation for the Eppley Building at UNO, the total appropriation for the Theatre Arts Building in Lincoln at UNL and it removes the \$25,000, the planning money for the library at Kearney, because that also had a potential future impact in the vicinity of \$4 million. It reduces this year's, then it does have these additions. It does put the chiller back in. It does put \$300,000 in for an emergency generator at the Med School in Omaha and it adds \$250,000 of miscellaneous renovation funds for the Board of Regents in which this year there is, correction, \$200,000, in which this year there is no appropriation that we normally do for miscellaneous renovation. But I repeat again that I have said several times that I am not opposed to any of these projects. My concern was totally one of trying to keep the total budget within the guidelines that for next year that the committee also adopted for this year. I want to point out that the recommendations that the Appropriations Committee has made is right on target for this year as far as staying under 7%. There is nothing in the capital construction bill this year that would in itself forces us to exceed the 7% limitation and my concern was totally one of the future impact and I wanted the body to at least have the opportunity to recognize that problem. I do not think it needs to be a prolonged discussion, Mr. Chairman, but this is the purpose of the amendment and what it does.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Kahle and then Senator Dworak. We are speaking on the Warner motion to return the bill to Select File.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. Speaker, members, still being somewhat