

going to be directly or indirectly repaid by the occupation tax increase?

SENATOR WARNER: It would be indirectly and obviously that amendment is not as yet attached to a bill because...but I, my understanding it, it will be offered at an appropriate piece of legislation.

SENATOR MOORE: And your amendment to 1268 strictly paid back from the General Fund and so I mean that's why I say indirectly. It's not...

SENATOR WARNER: That is correct. It would not be...that increase in the corporate occupation tax for two years would not be dedicated to this purpose, but the revenue that would be generated would, in fact, be adequate to provide the money to, from the General Fund to go back over to the Cash Reserve Fund.

SENATOR MOORE: Thank you, Senator Warner. I...well, I guess I don't know if opposition is the right word for Senator Warner's amendment. Obviously this was an issue of frustration in the debate of LB 1063. I still have the opinion that we should have found a way to make 1063 work. Actually with the Warner amendment and the corresponding Landis amendment to, I don't remember the number of the bill that is coming up later. As far as, it is strictly for a cash flow reason. I guess that would arguably be the intended purpose of this fund because it is not a permanent transfer out of the money, out of the fund. The only concern I have is you link three different bills together that would make it work. My preference would have been to make it work somehow on 1063 other it being to move the dates back or postponing for a year the sales tax refund knowing full well that would directly affect me because we bought a tractor in the last two months, but I guess I will be in principle I'll still stand opposed to Senator Warner's amendment because the way it was handled in 1063 while at the same time I would understand that it's strictly for cash flow purposes, will be repaid by another amendment, I have concern about linking all the bills together and also have a concern about drawing on the Cash Reserve Fund to balance with this amendment. If the bill with the transfer that my original bill had, with Senator Warner's amendment you basically are going to get that fund down to about \$17 million at the end of '93. My concern is as tight as things are getting in the state budget there is a concern that that may not be an adequate reserve fund, but at least with the