

to cities. It comes from the Syracuse study in a modified form and the Syracuse study said only give money to cities that need it. Mine is a modification in that I recommend that we continue to give money to all cities but we look at the income level of city residents, at least, when you allocate these funds. It seems to me that's good policy. In fact, if you want to help small towns, that's really the only sensible way to look at this, otherwise, outside of the advantage of doing some long term bonding which my towns have expressed an interest in doing, and I don't know how good that option is for them yet, frankly, but I really would like you to take a look at this option. There are really three options here. There is MIRF, unamended; there is MIRF with my amendment; there is this option. I would ask you to take a look, if you haven't had time to take a look at my proposal that was delivered to your office yesterday, and wait on this, see what happens on MIRF. I don't have any crystal ball at all as far as...any more than any of the rest of you do as far as what's going to be approved down the hall and where we're going to end up on this and I guess I would, at this point, like to keep my options open. I would like to have an opportunity to talk about this other policy choice and so I would ask you to reject this amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Moore, please.

SENATOR MOORE: Okay, Mr. President and members, I rise to oppose Senator Landis's amendment and I really cannot add anything to what the other opponents have already said but simply for myself that I voted against LB 683. I think we would be wiser developing some sort of need based assistance that would truly help smaller communities to...with a dollar amount that would actually help them. Obviously, as the MIRF bill is now written, large chunks of money goes to Lincoln and Omaha, two towns that already have exercised an option given to them with the local option sales tax to the tune of several million dollars. And the MIRF bill just simply adds...guarantees for the next 20 years (inaudible) additional millions of dollars from the state level from the cigarette tax, money that would be available for other things. And I am not willing to do that but I, myself, am willing to do what Senator Lan...I mean, I, myself, am willing to do what is in LB 525. I think that is prudent to increase the state aid to municipalities. I find it odd that the very people whose job it is to secure state aid for municipalities are supporting this amendment. I think that's unique and unusual. I understand why. I think it's a mistake