

programs that you are wanting to add back in, but the loss, the total loss of federal dollars was what?

SENATOR HALL: The...Mr. President and members, Senator Bernard-Stevens, the total loss of federal dollars would be \$2,874,222.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: So the net effect of that would be that the state actually lost by this "veto saving" 1.2 million?

SENATOR HALL: Well, you could argue that. I would argue that we actually lost \$2.8 million...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: In the federal funds?

SENATOR HALL: In federal funds, that's correct.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Yeah. Members of the body, I hope...thank you, Senator Hall, I hope that you pay attention to this particular portion of the discussion. This is not nec...this is not just an argument, do we want to add monies back in. You need to look at what the veto did in the first place. The veto when it...when we...when the Governor x-ed out \$1.6 million, what also happened is that we lost 2.8 million of federal dollars. Again, let me restate that. When we vetoed out the 1.6, we actually lost 2.8 more in...\$2.8 million in federal dollars. So, in essence, one way to look at this is by restoring what Senator Hall is trying to do, we also gain back the 2.8 million, which would, in essence, be a gain in these programs. Or if you want to reverse the argument, by the Governor vetoing this portion out and losing the federal dollars, we actually lost money. We didn't gain any money at all on the budget side when you are looking at these programs. So I would argue very vociferously that this particular package is a good one to override because financially on the federal dollars it does make sense for Nebraska to do so. Would I support all overrides? No. But this one fiscally makes sense, and I particularly was pleased that the Appropriations Chair did not oppose the package, and I think what I'm hearing is, yes, this probably is a good thing to do, but we want to be careful that we don't jeopardize other things that might be coming up later on this particular portion, particularly as it relates to the University of Nebraska. But on this particular issue, fiscally it really does make sense not to jeopardize the \$2.8 million of the federal dollars to keep these programs