

September 30, 1992 LB 11

perspective and say the State of Nebraska has serious problems ahead and it's reasonable to expect for us to save some for ourselves and face the problems that we're going to have to face ahead. I oppose Senator Schellpeper's amendment on this point, too.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Hall, you're next.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I just rise to offer an opportunity here. I listened intently to Senator Landis' arguments. And, based on his arguments, I was tempted to offer an amendment to extend the MIREF program 50 years, so we could save another \$100 million and we could all go home, because that would solve our problem. I mean that's...the logic of that argument in terms of \$9 million being real money, spread out over 18 years, that's maybe a solution to our problems, if we just could all live long enough to see the fruits of our labor at that point in time. The question is, do we make the cut, or don't we? And Senator Moore clearly pointed out that a cut needs to be made. The stream of revenue argument has gone away, because it's now how can we save as much of this program as possible, and that's what the second Schellpeper amendment is about. It doesn't change the issue any more, make it any more palatable, or this whole session any more palatable. We have a job to do, and that's cut the budget. I would urge you to again reject this Schellpeper amendment.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Hefner, you're next, please.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, here again we have, I feel, a good compromise, half a million dollars a year, which is, I feel, quite a little. We're going back on our word and the bill that we passed several years ago. I feel that the state has this commitment. A previous speaker said that, well, state had a commitment and had to use the cigarette tax to pay off some of the bonds. That's probably true. But the cities and villages have commitments, too. And I know that some of them have made these commitments with the MIREF funds. So I think we need to consider that. Like I said before, half a million dollars a year, Senator Landis says that that's a cost of 9 million in 18 years. And this is certainly correct. But I just think that we're going back on our commitment, and I certainly hate to do it. If we take these