

at some point in time we need to think about the priority bill system a little bit more. I always considered the true appropriation bills to be naturally an exclusion to the priority bill system. But I don't consider LB 564 to be an appropriations bill. It doesn't seem to me that it is appropriate for it to be on our agenda at this particular juncture. Now it may be on our consent calendar, or it may be on our special order, but it doesn't seem appropriate to me to be sliding it in here with the other appropriations bills. Under a broad definition of appropriations such as that, obviously, all revenue bills become appropriations bills. I don't think that is what is intended by the priority bill system. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Thank you, Mr. President. This is for all members of the Legislature, but especially for Senator Beutler. This is not meant to be slid in. We cannot simply raise the dollars as a cash fund for this agency without having specific legislation to do the same thing rather than taking general funds. We could have taken general funds and given it to this agency for its next years' operation. We felt that it should be self-supporting. But we cannot simply put it into our budget document as cash funds. It would have to go in as general funds. We did not choose to go general funds since it is an agency that has traditionally been cash funds. But in order to allow that agency the flexibility with their fees to support that agency it had to take a separate bill. It came from us, it came from the Appropriations Committee. It was assigned to the Government Committee for its public hearing. But it is a very integral part of the total appropriations for state agencies and as such it is not meant to be slid in in any way. But it is a mechanism for when you have an agency that has to have a separate bill, in order to do what you want to do with the appropriations process. There is no reason not to have a separate bill and have it be a cash fund when that is the way it has been done, but it needs to be tied together because otherwise it will absolutely take additional general fund dollars which will affect the dollars in our other budget bill. That is why they were put together. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is there any discussion on the substantive part of LB 564? Senator Haberman.