

September 30, 1992 LB 11

don't know. It's of more than passing concern to me, and I think you need to understand that. The other thing, it's the difference between 1.5 and 1.3, and, sure, in as far as there's some good fairness points to be made on this issue, the only thing different between the MIREF earmark and the other earmarks, the other earmarks were all earmarking cigarette cents, whereas MIREF earmarked \$4.5 million. And if 15 years from now 28 cents only raised \$4.5 million instead of 35 or 40, MIREF would get it all. And so that's why there's a basic difference between those other earmarks and the MIREF earmark. Whereas the other earmarks, if it's tied to a declining source of revenue, or at least in the last 20 years it has been a declining source of revenue, the cigarette tax, it automatically goes down with that. MIREF does not go down with that, the way it's...that's one of my, one of my many problems with the bill in its original form. That's why MIREF is indeed different than those in the way it's statutorily earmarked. But as far as the point being made, you know, if you want to share the pain among all of them, that's a fair question to ask. But the MIREF earmark certainly is different in the fact that it's a set dollar amount, really no different than an appropriation. And the other items in Senator Lynch's amendment are, indeed, cigarette tax earmarks that go with the flow, so to speak, of the cigarette tax. And when they go down, the money going to those earmarked programs goes down, whereas the MIREF earmark, it does not. That \$4.5 million comes off the top regardless of how much money is generated by the cigarette tax. And so, I mean, as I stated earlier, I mean if you don't like the amendment, you don't vote for Senator Schellpeper's, or vote for Senator Conway's, I think Senator Lynch's, it may be invalid concerns, I want to stress that, but I think it raises some legitimate concerns in my point of view that I don't know the answer to. And I think the body would be wise, at least at this point in time, to reject Senator Lynch's amendment, though I understand the argument he's making, if you want to share the pain equally among all recipients.

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

SENATOR CUDABACK: Mr. Speaker, members, I think Senator Moore just made my point. He said that it wasn't the intent that if the money was there, but the money will be there. That money was stipulated to be such and such dollars. So there's no guessing. This body committed those monies to the municipalities. So, with that, I will support the Lynch