

Let me reiterate what that amendment does as you look at it. This amendment uses per capita money income for each city and it adjusts the amount received by each community either up or down, so you have some winners and some losers. But let me stress, every community continues to receive funds, but the formula is more a needs-driven formula the way it is currently crafted. Cities with higher than average per capita income would receive less. Cities with lower per capita income would receive a little bit more. There are 36 losers out of the 534 communities under the current formula. I will withdraw that amendment today. I would ask you to study it and take a look at it. I think it is a reasonable needs-driven kind of formula that could, in fact, make a good deal of difference among the poorest communities in this state. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: It is withdrawn.

CLERK: Senator Warner, would move to amend the bill. (See pages 1881-82 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this amendment does not change the purpose of the bill, and I am not for the bill, but it would change somewhat the way it would function. The bill as it now is written, in effect, gives the 4.5 million that is to be distributed under 683 in effect off of the top of the cigarette proceeds and it remains that way throughout the distribution process. This amendment merely changes the draft to be comparable to other bonding provisions that we already have to be in conformity with, LB 683's provisions, so that all bonding provisions are treated the same or equitably. The amendment, as is true now, places 25 cents of the cigarette tax, 27 minus 2 cents, that is 1 cent to NORDA, the other then to Cancer Research Fund. The way it would be worded, that all of these outstanding bonds would be less, what would be placed in the General Fund would be an amount less this year, \$13,582,766, which is the total of all the earmarked bonding provisions including the 4.5 of LB 683, and the distribution then would come from the General Fund in the form of an appropriation, just as is the case now. The purpose is not to treat this distribution differently than the other bonding provisions that we have that are used primarily in the area of capital construction. And it seems to me it makes more sense that an aid program at least does not take precedence over