

September 30, 1992 LB 11

SENATOR ROBINSON: Specific...

SENATOR MOORE: I'm not asking a question. His mike shouldn't be on. The only thing we have not cut yet in the last biennium has been cities. Now if you don't want to do it, that's fine. That's the way it goes. Where are you going to find the money as I said? I mean I don't know, you know, Senator Haberman withdrew his additional 1 percent, whether or not we have to do that. If we don't do it now, if you don't take a cut like this now, you have to revisit a cut like this or others in January. I think it's a timely way, manner to do it now. I mean, you know, if you want to get Senator Schellpeper's amendment, I think you're going to have a good argument for immunity come January. I don't think that's fair. I think that the body should reject Senator Schellpeper's amendment and understand all the, certainly in my opinion, what all the facts are on this. I mean it's going for good things. If you want to continue money going there, that's fine. But understand what else you have cut on every other entity and you for your own mind have to figure out where you need to put MRF funds and the cities in a general and what sort of immunity you want to grant them.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Cudaback.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Mr. Speaker and members, I was in the process there of trying to find out the exact language; and I guess it doesn't say that you can or can't obligate exactly, but the commitment was and the intent was for this purpose. Whenever you say you're going to receive money for 20 years, what are you implying? You are implying that that money will be available. Sometimes when there's no date, then that way it's kind of, you know, it's an iffy thing. But whenever the Legislature, this body, an honorable body such as we are commits themselves for a 20-year period by this type of legislation, I just think it's a commitment. Remember the revenue sharing days, the revenue sharing days that the federal government gave all of us, the counties, the cities, everyone? Then they tried to withdraw. We thought we was going to be dead and some cities did obligate, made obligations on the fact that they would be receiving these revenue sharing dollars. It was a killer. The state should learn from these type of circumstances. Here we're in the same situation. The municipalities were under the assumption that they would be receiving these dollars for the next 20 years. Let's don't tease, folks. If you're going to tease, I mean let's make it known it's a tease. This was a fact. So like I