

September 30, 1992 LB 11

amendment I believe was on the Journal page...is that coming up...identifying? There it is, page 108, on...in the Journal. What this amendment does basically is I guess you might call it somewhat of a striking of a compromise to some degree. We are in a budget crisis period if you will. We are looking for cuts. We are trying to get some things done in that regard, but much of what we're doing is going to have some long-term impact, at least in terms of planning and other kinds of consequences that people are quite concerned with. What this amendment basically does is it takes \$1.5 million of the cigarette tax money that ordinarily would go into MIREF and this coming year, commencing in July 1st of '93 and continuing until July 1st of '94, those funds are withheld to the tune of 1.5 million. Three million would still then flow into the municipalities. It would be a 33 percent cut as the green copy came out of committee and then was intended to do. But rather than it going on into perpetuity and that particular status of being 3 million instead of the 4 1/2 million flow, it would only do it for this one year. It would be a \$1.5 million cut for the one year. At that time we may have a little better handle on things, and we can then make the decision on how to deal with MIREF on into the future. So it would be simply taking 1.5 million, putting it into General Funds, letting that lapse now for the purposes that we're concerned with of the budget period, and then it would continue on. So in essence it puts us into a situation where the municipalities would make their contribution towards the short-term aspect of the budget crisis, and at that point we may find it a little more amenable to decide what the impact is. I'm offering this amendment in part again as I spoke against the cuts for MIREF previously as it would...on Monday when it was on General File, in that one of the philosophical tenets that I tried to and attempted to ascribe to and maintain throughout this period is not putting ourselves in a situation where the strides that we've made with respect to the property taxpayer, that we simply pass the burden back onto them. I think to some extent this is an abridgement of that philosophy; but, at least it's for the short run. It's not a long-term burden that goes back on the property taxpayers. Most of these projects that I'm familiar with, at least in my area and I assume around the state, are important serious projects that are being handled by the cities, things that in some cases they have to do, whether it'd be a tagging of their water systems or whether it's any other infrastructural improvements. Many of these communities are battling violently to maintain economic development activity, and in some cases, many of these infrastructural