

April 1, 1996

LB 1189, 1290

politics out of it, would this particularly put him in an even stronger position and put us in a weaker position in regards to overrides?

SENATOR BROWN: I don't believe so. I believe that it is about us and our decision-making. And we made the commitment last year on the floor of the Legislature to put this money in, and so it's just a matter of timing. And I believe that the reasons to do it far outweigh any reasons of lack of flexibility, because the flexibility is only to spend more than we have.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: (Laugh.) Senator Brown, I think when you're here a little longer, I think you may change your response, you know, after a couple more years on the Appropriations Committee. But one of the things that concerns me... I guess, Senator Brown, let me follow-up with one other question. How does this relate to LB 1290? Because, see, 1290...let me go back even one step further. LB 38 that we passed a year or so ago, you know, if we had too much dollars then anticipated, it transferred back, and if we had under, it would transfer back to General Fund. (LB) 1290 that we're passing, which I have some concerns with anyway, but it's overall a good concept; 1290 is a bill that in essence takes money off the table because we have a one-way transfer and we don't ever transfer back from the Cash Reserve to the General Fund. That will be gone.

SENATOR BROWN: We don't automatically transfer back.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Pardon?

SENATOR BROWN: We don't automatically transfer.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Correct. Under LB 38 it's automatically; under 1290 it's an automatic one-way street.

SENATOR BROWN: Right.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: So we're already putting more dollars off the table. Why is the need to do this at this point in time?

SENATOR BROWN: It's not more dollars, it is...it's a timing issue, once again. We can still, if we...if we feel that we