

September 30, 1992 LB 11

offer another alternative. After you've heard all of the alternatives you wonder if there are any more, and I don't think there are any more after this. But would give those people a chance who are concerned about the programs for the cities and our obligation for those, and our obligations, on the other hand, to bond counsel. I don't think this would affect the possibility of bonding, because it...although the source of funds is important, we also consider the good name, reputation and character of the agency you're doing business with. And I think bond counsel would understand the state would not permit that obligation to fail. On the other hand, it's rather interesting when we talk about obligations that we have to make sure bond counsel is satisfied, it doesn't seem to fit into the same category as the kind of obligations we have to people like cities, or even, in the case of some of these cuts, to people. Therefore it seems to make some sense that this be considered. What it would simply do is to provide back to the General Fund, in addition to well over \$20 million that now goes into the General Fund from cigarette tax, another 1,225,000, possibly. With that, I'd ask for your support.

SPEAKER BAACK: You've heard the closing on the amendment by Senator Lynch. We will now vote on the amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Have you all voted? Have you all voted on the Lynch amendment? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 15 ayes, 20 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: The amendment fails.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment is by Senator Schellpeper. (Schellpeper amendment appears on page 141 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. This is basically about like the first amendment. Instead of taking 5 percent, we're going to take \$500,000 a year for the life of the agreement, which amounts to about 11 percent, little over 11 percent each year reduction. Now that is more than any other entity is even being thinking about cutting. You take \$500,000 a year for the balance of the contract, which is about 18 years, you're talking about a lot of dollars of the cities helping the