

September 30, 1992 LB 9, 11

but recognizing that we do have to try to find revenues for the General Fund, in addition to that 26 million or so that's now coming out of cigarette tax money back into the General Fund, my amendment would provide about another 1,225,000 at tops, maybe a little less than that. What it simply does is, that's all I have to say, this is it, folks. It takes 5 percent from everybody who's on the list. Think about that, everybody that's now receiving cigarette tax money, say if they're getting a million bucks they'll now get 950,000. But this amendment would do that. Now I know that procedurewise there are some commitments from bonding point of view for the university. And from talking with their very able and competent staff and lobbyists in the Rotunda, the possibility exists that one of those funds, which will run out in two years, that there could be a 60,000 shortfall. But traditionally and historically every one of those funds, of all those obligations have not only been met, but the balance of what was necessary to pay off that obligation automatically reverted back to the General Fund. So I'm not quite sure if there would be a terrible problem for the university or any other commitments that are involved in the distribution of cigarette tax money at this time. What it does, it doesn't provide the one million-five as recommended in the Governor's budget, but it does provide the 1,225,000. That's it, up or down. I'll try to answer any questions you might have, providing information necessary. With that, I'd ask for your support.

SPEAKER BAACK: Discussion on the amendment by Senator Lynch? Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, I guess, Mr. Speaker and members, as Senator Lynch mentioned, the basic concern I have about his amendment is the concern over doing away with those earmarks. And, obviously, the State of Nebraska, with the cigarette tax, over the years has entered into a variety of long-term packages, long term being something more than two years. Obviously, the concern I have with this...with his amendment, he already outlined it very well. Will you fall short in your obligations for those bonds, you may or may not. Obviously, the concern I have is when you...if you change that, you not only jeopardize the present obligations, my concern, I think LB 9, the next thing on the list that's a bonding obligation, I think you're going to jeopardize your ability to sell bonds there. Is that a red herring? I don't know. Is it legitimate? I think it's a legitimate question to raise. Would it actually happen? I