

off the bonds on the sewage treatment facility. Those bonds were over and above the amount that community gets from MIRF, it's just that 120,000 is going towards that exclusively. So some communities are doing that. The concern that Senator Ashford and you kind of mentioned as far as the bonding side of things, some communities are using MIRF funds to go towards helping pay off a bond, but, obviously, no bonds to date have been sold on MIRF in any way, shape or form. Those are GEO bonds sold by the community with the full faith and credit of the community, but those bonds are not MIRF bonds. And so if you did away with MIRF, those communities would have a problem paying off the bonds but that would be MIRF funds...they're not MIRF funds that the bondholder is expecting there. There is other projects that range from buying radios, for a road for trucks, sidewalks around parks, I mean, it runs the gambit and, I mean, I don't think it's that much different than the 1990 report as to what it goes for. I mean, some of them go for, you know, obviously, as you are well aware of, is that, obviously, roads and bridges are exempted from MIRF, you can't use them there. But it's, I mean, it's a wide range. In my opinion, none of those are...none of those projects are money...are things that money shouldn't be spent on, I may raise the question on what my definition of infrastructure is. I think it's long-term huge things, not radios. That's it. But that's just editorial. Lastly, your last question, is it inside the call? Well, obviously, the first line in the call is to reduce appropriations approved by the Ninety-Second Legislature. Simply decreasing a number from 4.5 to 3, if that's not in the call, LB 1 is not in the call.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senators. Senator Schmit, followed by Senators Hefner, Byars, Bernard-Stevens, Wehrbein and Conway.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam Chairman, as Senator Scotty Moore said, now the fun begins. It would be easy for me to support this bill because I did not support the original MIRF proposal. The reason I did not support it was because of the fact that I knew it would not be very long until we would find ourselves in a crunch and then we would be taking away that which we had promised. Time, after time, after time on this floor we establish programs and then we take it away. The headline in the World-Herald said 105.6 million would be cut in budget plans. Ladies and gentlemen, it isn't anywhere near that. We're not even talking about 105 million, I'm just going to mention three bills. LB 9 would save 7.6 million over three