

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

February 25, 2000 LB 1436A

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Kristensen, members of the Legislature, I find this most unusual that an A bill is being ambushed. We don't usually do this in the legislative process. I think everybody assumed that we would have a next full debate on this matter on Select File, and I think probably that's what Senator Jensen intended, too, and not to ambush the A bill, but let me just say briefly that I think there are answers to every thing that's being said right now. I think there are good answers to it, and I don't know if we want to have a full-blown debate here today or not, but if we do, so be it, I guess. But let me just make a quick response to what has been said so far. First of all, the money will be in the fund, notwithstanding that maybe at this moment in time the confluence of attributing interest to the fund and taking money out for other purposes that are allowed by the fund may show a short existing balance at the moment, but I don't think that anybody doubts but that the money would be there for this purpose. Secondly, the raid on the trust fund is an interesting concept but two things need to be said about it. First of all, this is not a raid on principal. The trust fund will always exist. No money is coming out of the principal of the trust fund. You are not doing anything to the corpus of the trust fund whatsoever. It's just a suggestion that an allocation of a portion of the interest earned on the trust fund could be used for this purpose. The other thing that I think is not correct is that this purpose for which Senator Bohlke intends to use this fund is not outside of the statutory concept that is right there in the statute, that describes the purposes for which this money may be used. Tobacco use prevention programs are included. I think that the key question here, the one that really should be discussed, and I think the one we will pick up on General File, is whether this is in the nature of a grant or an ongoing program. I understand Senator Bohlke intends to make it more in the nature of a grant by suggesting the reinstatement of a two-year sunset on it. And once it becomes a grant, then the key question becomes should it go through the Health Care Advisory Committee, who has already informed Senator Smith that they don't intend to improve it, or should it be allowed to go the way...should it be allowed to be treated as a grant without going through the process that has been previously established? That, I think, is...those, I think, are the real questions. Thank you.