

May 24, 1989

LB 683, 683A

PRESIDENT: We will move on to number seven and a motion, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a motion from Senator Warner. That motion is that the Legislature request the Governor to return LB 683 and 683A for further consideration, and later reconsider on Final Reading the vote for technical or clarifying amendments.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I filed this motion the other day. As I looked through the rule book, I could find no prohibition from any member making a motion to return a bill that has been sent to the Governor's desk. There is a prohibition, however, on reconsideration which is limited, essentially, to the introducer of the bill, and I think also with additional language for clarifying and technical amendments. I probably took some liberty with those two words as I tend to assume that when you are out of money that is at least a technical problem, and that is kind of where we are. This is a 4.5 million reduction in revenue for each of at least the next four years and beyond that, and we are in a position, which we will talk about later, where whatever we override comes out somewhere else, or whatever we pass comes out somewhere else, and this 9 million in this next two years obviously has to be made up somewhere. If you look at the green sheet, even through this biennium as we stand today with bills passed and bills vetoed and not overridden, we do not even make the minimum 3 percent reserve required by law. It is 2.91, if you look on the green sheet based on current projections by the advisory board. When you go out beyond that based on the assumptions, and one can argue at that point, I understand that, using different assumptions but, nevertheless, using those assumptions it is obvious we are headed for a tax break adjustment of some kind after 1991 unless things turn out much better in the economy than what has been the average. So for those reasons and an opportunity, whether then... I have no idea, perhaps the Governor has signed the bill or not to sign it. I don't know. I do know if she signs it, it means another 9 million of vetoes, and she doesn't really even have a choice because she has got to get up to that minimum reserve, and in the long-range, prudent planning for the state financially, this is even more reason to do it. With those comments, I would yield whatever time I have left to Senator Landis to, first, indicate whether he would be