

January 23, 1974

him to do. Now it is true, he has the sole responsibility to determine the intent of what we meant to be affective within the law, of which sometimes is not too clear. The other thing is he shall operate the government of the state in an efficient manner. And what does that mean? That means he operates from a fiscal standpoint upon the basis of the combined judgement of this body as to what he is going to get in the way of money, and to the extent we might decide to earmark those funds that we give to the Executive branch of government in order to administer the affairs of this state. The constitution give him the right to suggest, to suggest.. not demand. To suggest that we consider what he thinks through his source of information what we ought to consider. Then he has the power to persuasion by the ability to veto all bills well in the budget bill he can line them out to the point that they don't exceed that what he recommended, or any program that is a new program. But when all of these things are done. When each department of government has had their say and their way to the extent we can prevail. That ought to end it. Now one of the things that distrubed me was that he indicated that some of here were responsible. For the first time I went before the Board of Equalization when they met, upon my own motivation, and my own desire, and my own judgement of government. Now I don't know what went through the minds of Senator Marvel who was also there, and I never talked to anyone of the three members of the Board of Equalization who happened to be on the other side of the political fence. Neither did I ever talk to the Governor of the State of Nebraska, Mr. Peters, who was the other members of this board. Now what happened there, and I leave it to you whether it is irresponsible or not. I asked and it was discussed there. Mr. Peters, representative of the administration, had taken into consideration the future obligations of this state authorized and accepted by this body. They said no. Well then we were faced with the position, we had twenty million dollars approximately laying there for no good purpose. At least no good purpose in my mind, and they have a different opinion on that. Now what the discussion was between the Governor of this state and myself was if you have this money, and in the past you have advocated the reduction of the taxes, meaning the sales and the income tax, why shouldn't we use that at that time for that purpose to reduce the income tax, which later they did. Now we discussed along the idea that if we didn't have the money there carried over, if there was not an incentive for him and this body to spend this twenty million dollars, and if we knew at the time the cupboard was bare, as it now is, then, both the administrative and legislative branch of government would be confronted with the responsibility knowing that whatever we spend we are going to have to raise. We didn't have one of these flexible cushions. In which either branch could ride for example without too much responsibility in the area of the twenty million dollars. Talk about political expediency. That's our stock and trade. It not only applies to us it applies to the administration and to the Chief Executive. It's not a brand of something that is unclean. When I look around this body, I look over the Executive branch I don't find one

(End Belt #2)