

question of, is this, I guess, a good or a bad thing to do. I mean anytime you take and you set money aside, one can make the argument that you are being conservative and that there is, basically, no need to spend it. Now the other side of the coin is that there are good programs out there, there are good programs in place such as, for example, the bill that we spent most of two days on, the capital construction thing, where we talk about one-time expenditures, \$72 million that are one-time expenditures, that if the revenue continues to flow in, and when you only affect the revenue, the increase in revenue that we have gotten from the income tax, for example, to the tune of about \$18 million, you are not putting a dent in those dollars that are going to flow in and continue to flow in. When you have one-time expenditures like we talked about in capital construction, when you have a one-year program like we have talked in LB 84 to the tune of \$98 million, add those...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...add those two together, that is 160, 170 million dollars that is one only one-time expenditure. We will be back here. We don't, I think, need to put the \$50 million away for a rainy day at this point. I would urge the body to oppose this portion of the committee amendments.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I am going to vote to advance 525. I am going to vote for the Hall amendment in this case. I think that the other provisions of 525 represent legitimate alternatives to existing packages on the floor. There is an interesting discussion between Medicaid and indigent care. Some negotiated settlement might be reasonable there. Some discussion might continue. We profit from that. The comparison of MIRF to state aid to cities, fair enough, two different mechanisms to do that which is already up there. But this is an option that has been offered to us by the Appropriations Committee. Frankly, and one of the things it might do is it might ultimately, you can't actually say defease bonds, but it might actually do an idea that I have supported, but it is an option that isn't really viable today, and I will tell you why. It is not an alternative to any specific program out there. It is an option to the entire green sheet, and a point is I think we all know enough that there are sufficient loyalties to the green sheet that this really isn't a viable