

budget that we passed, we have, in many cases, reduced General Fund expenditures in the outlying year, the second year of the biennium, and used those monies to fund other areas, or to transfer it into the Cash Reserve, because we assumed that we would get federal dollars. And that's why we had the, I think, \$14 million in the second year of the biennium. What Senator Brown's amendment would do is assume that we're going to get the federal dollars and then, since we're going to get it this next biennium, let's go ahead and transfer the money early. That's what the assumption is. And again the danger of that assumption is that the dollars will not arrive. If the dollars do not arrive, then those areas in the budget that we have already decreased General Fund, transfer those money over to, whether it's special ed or whatever the case may be, now we're short on the General Fund side because we were assuming that those dollars would be there. Now, next year when we come back we'll have to have a General Fund expenditure or request to increase spending in order to cover the areas that will not be there with Maximus. And that will be under a time period when we may be under a spending cap, we may be talking about tax increases for property tax relief as far as services lost, at a time when the federal government may be cutting back. That will be a very difficult time. What I think the Legislature's best position would be, and certainly I would maybe take a little different viewpoint if I were on the Appropriations Committee, but I don't think so...I feel the appropriations...the Legislature should take the following position--we will believe that the Maximus monies will be coming. We see...we have our swords out, we're chasing windmills, we see silver linings behind every dark cloud. But just in case they don't, just in case the Maximus money does not come, we're going to keep the money where it's at in the General Fund, and if it doesn't come, we then have flexibility to decide, are we going to replace the money or are we not? I think that is a wiser decision to take. What this amendment would do is say...it says regardless of if the General Fund dollars come or not, we're taking it off the table and it will be more difficult for the Legislature to bring those resources back in order to spend dollars for programs we've already obligated ourselves to spend for. And I don't think that...I think it's good for taking money and putting it aside, which 1290 will do, and I think 1290 will help us build that Cash Reserve with a one-way door rather than a two-way door. I think that will be good. But I don't think this combined with that is the best flexibility for the Legislature to have. So I