

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 21, 1999

LB 881

person who certainly believes that we need to have those dollars for a rainy day, but we're not...we're not giving that money away. It's still going to be there. And I agree with the attitude that the...you know, in listening to what's happened this past year and understanding the makeup of this Legislature and their attitude, it appears to me that there's not going to be a big attempt to throw money at a program just because somebody wants it. And I do think the ability for the Appropriations Committee to have funds available in times when there may be that exceptional need will be there. And so as...again, not being that well-versed on the field of finance, it appears to me that what the bill would do is something that I am not totally in agreement with. So therefore, I'm going to stand in opposition to the Beutler amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Beutler, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bohlke, I'm not sure that I gave you a direct response. I meant to be giving you a direct response. But I think the direct response to your question is, yes, there is that difference. However, it is not a difficult thing, if economic down...a downside is seen, to get at that money. But it at least identifies for you in a clear sort of way what it...what money is there and for what purpose. And to the extent that you need that money to balance off the downside of the economic cycle, then that money ought to be taken. And it would be taken in a specific bill, and so that everybody could see why you were taking the money. And to the extent that it wasn't needed for that purpose and was being taken for other purposes, that would also be clear to the public. And then, finally, there's a third...there's a good reason, there's a bad reason, and there's another good reason, and that is, if the fund is so high that you want to give it back to the taxpayer, that's a good reason too. And that's what the Governor is doing, and that's what the debate is all about today. What is the appropriate level of the Cash Reserve Fund? But if you understand this particular amendment, this is in no way contrary, in fact, assists the Governor's purposes, if anything. So did I...is that enough of an answer? I wasn't sure. Okay. Senator Vrtiska indicated that perhaps there was something about fooling the public. I would argue very strongly that this is