

May 20, 1985

LB 722

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, first I need to ask Senator DeCamp a question so I'm...I think I understand what you're saying.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp is available.

SENATOR WARNER: Would I be correct, Senator DeCamp, that some reductions have already been made in 722? This 3 percent reduction, if an agency say had a million appropriation and we had made a specific reduction of \$100,000 so it now it \$900,000, do you intend your 3 percent cut to be times the original appropriation, a million, or 3 percent times the reduced...

SENATOR DECAMP: Towards the reduced.

SENATOR WARNER: Okay.

SENATOR DECAMP: Strictly on the reduced.

SENATOR WARNER: Right.

SENATOR DECAMP: And it's important to get that into the record. I guess I should have said that. I was instructed by the bill drafter to say that.

SENATOR WARNER: Right. Well, Mr. President, at this point I guess we're at a moment of truth on appropriations for all of us, probably have been for quite some time, as a matter of fact. And I guess since an across the board cut not to exceed 1 percent was adopted in the committee, in part I think in realization that deeper cuts, particularly in aid programs, would be very difficult to do, most certainly would have some impact on local property taxes where it is an aid program. I'm more concerned with across the board cuts or equally concerned, I should say, in other programs as well. Whenever you do across the board cuts and there are some exclusions here which help, but there are, obviously, some programs within an agency that is say 85 percent salaries and 15 percent operating money. A 3 percent cut on that agency is a significantly different impact than an agency that was say 25 percent personnel and 75 percent operations and that's...certainly it's possible. So I always have a reluctance to accept across the board reductions. Fortunately this one does make some exclusions

5809