

we have two problems at least from a payout with 829. First is that the bill, given its present revenue projections, if you take into account the total life span of what it takes to collect the money, on it's very face is about \$4 million short between '93 and '97. Secondly, as I've mentioned when I failed in my attempt to amend the bill to include the income tax, there's a cash flow problem with the bill as it now reads, even with the \$93 million because a portion of that up to, depending on how it comes in, 7 to 13 million dollars will not come in until the next biennium. And, you know, if you would ignore biennial budgets, the money would come there but the concern at least I have is the Governor...as the Governor tries to balance the budget within the biennium, he may or may not wish to include that that's coming in the next biennium in it's payout. I don't know the answer to that. I guess I just don't really care to take that chance. What this amendment would do is basically, quite honestly, give the Governor some additional flexibility as he sets the state budget because my concern is if we pass this bill as is, he will not only take the \$4 million but he will also take the other 7 to 13 million dollars out of all the remaining part of the budget. If we adopt this amendment, he would have the ability to decrease the line item in LB 829A whatever dollar amount he wants to, and I would hope at least we would have the ability to override that if he wants to decrease that. But I think by doing this you give the Governor some additional flexibility, one, to balance the total state budget for the next biennium because instead of taking the shortfall of 829 out on the budget or remaining A bills, the Governor could choose to take it out of the local subdivisions' hide, as simple as that. And if we don't adequately fund it, I guess my attitude is if we're not going to raise enough money to pay off dollar for dollar, then maybe we shouldn't say we're going to pay off dollar for dollar and we should prorate it back to whatever amount we choose to fund it at. And, as I mentioned, it says that it shall be prorated, that's only if the funds are insufficient. Now, obviously, some are of the opinion at least that we have been more than adequately conservative on our estimates on what depreciation will bring in. And I, you know, that's just that, an educated guess, and we could be way low and when it's all said and done will bring in more than enough at the end of this biennium. But, nevertheless, as we set our budget in the final three days, I think we're better off guessing low than guessing high and with this amendment if we do not choose to fully fund it or if we...some are of the opinion that not only do we not fully fund it but it has a cash flow