

Mr. President and members of the Legislature, as you know, the rule requires that the Appropriation Committee make a report to the Legislature on the overrides of the mainline bills, in this case, the only two, well, three of them, LB 301, LB 308, which the committee's recommendation is for no overrides, and I will indicate to you that on 301, it dealt with judges salaries and there was a simple clerical I suppose you would call a math error which was in the bill from the Governor's bill through ours that was just simply never caught and so that is of no consequence. The second one on LB 308, it is 150,000, and at least in the claims portion which was reduced by the Governor, the number that the bill had in it originally would have been a number suggested to us by the agency probably six weeks ago now, maybe two months almost of an estimate, that is a deficit bill, of an estimate of what might be needed. My assumption can only be that with further time that the estimate of the amount of funds that are needed was reduced, hence we saw no need to override that. However, on LB 813 and 814, we had a divided vote of five to four, five members voting to recommend no overrides be enacted of the Governor's vetoes on those two bills. That was the one option. The other option was to recommend all of them, and the other is to take no position, and the third option was to make selected recommendations. However, I wish to call your attention, I suspect there may be some, and I hope it is not confusing, but there are some overrides that might be offered that by the nature of the bill's drafting, and it is drafted no different now than it has always been, but there may be more than one item within the same program and there is no way to separate those overrides. They both go or neither goes. In other cases, there could be many items where there is a lump sum appropriation to an agency, it might be many items, but by and large, there is no way to selectively override. You do them all or none. In other instances, there are a handful, some of you I suspect have already prepared motions, in which the dollar amount to the agency was vetoed but also some earmarking money within the budget where the language would say to the effect that contained within the appropriation is X amount of dollars for some purpose. You can override those earmarks, but that will not add any money to the appropriation to the agency. So whenever we do that, that particular function would be funded but also something else would not be, and we would not know what that is. So those things, you can argue it doesn't take any more money to make the override but you will be making a cut indirectly into something else. The final thing, we passed out two sheets of papers this morning, two different,