

not...I can understand vetoing a program that had never been actually...no money had actually been expended for, no effort had been put forward, or I can see decreasing an existing program. But this is a program where the promise was made and the promise is now being broken and that is just not fair. It's unlike, I think, most of the other vetoes in here where a promise has been made to local school districts to formulate early childhood programs, Senator Rasmussen has told you that they have done so, and now we, as a state government, are once more pulling the rug out from under them saying we're not going to fund it and it's just not fair. Again, I did not use the word "immoral" but I will use the word "unfair".

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Rasmussen.

SENATOR RASMUSSEN: Yes, Madam President, members of the body, just to go on a little bit further with this information about the potential availability of a little over \$300,000. The Department of Education testified in the budget request for General Funds to match federal funds in the school lunch program, would be about \$310,000 more than necessary in each of the '91-92 and '92-93. Prior to this time, the department didn't have the data necessary to project the interaction of the increased level of state aid in 1990-91 with a matching formula. It goes on to say that the Department of Education would offer to not distribute to schools the projected excess of \$310,000 General Funds in each year of the biennium in exchange for an override of the line-item veto of the General Fund appropriation to Program 440 in LB 843. I realize that what we're talking about here is that that money would have to come back in next year to General Funds and there is a little bit of a "trust me" kind of here that we're going to do this and that we could have to pay for the model projects. But I think the fact that they've put it in writing and that it does indicate that that money is still in the budget, has not been vetoed, that excess money would be available to support this program and the Department of Education is acknowledging that it's a worthwhile program and that they want to support it. I would remind you, if I did not mention it before, that the State Board of Education has identified early childhood education as their priority goal. And so I think this is probably reflected in this offer here that they're willing to try and find the monies to support this program. And, again, I would urge you to override the veto.