

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

May 1, 2003

LB 440

all, I have to say they helped us solve the Lincoln-Omaha problem. That's why they got involved in the first place. But they had a second agenda, and rightfully so, and their second agenda is, look, we want to help solve the two-year problem so it's okay if you want to take the MIRF funds, or it's okay if you want to take the state aid to municipalities, one or the other, but don't punish us perpetually; in other words, let us help for the two-year period; we'll take the \$6 million hit,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Ten seconds.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...but in LB 440, in the year 2005, put into the bill that MIRF will be restored.

SENATOR CUDABACK: I'm sorry, Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BEUTLER: And that's what this amendment does.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time is up.

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's the main purpose of the amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bourne and Senator Beutler. Senator Thompson.

SENATOR THOMPSON: Thank you. Just to make sure we're all clear where we are with this particular amendment, the big choice, and this is the amendment that's going to clear up, depending on your view, I guess, the Lincoln problem, and would not sunset MIRF in two years. So your choices with this bill are to say, yes, MIRF shouldn't go away, but we'll give it up for two years, but it will be back and it will be here till 2009, or this amendment, or do what I think we should do and just get it over with and...because it will back in two years as a bill, and sunset it. Now there are philosophical reasons for not doing this. They have to do with shifts to problems to the cities. I understand that. But we have to make some vertical cuts. I say why not just do it and get it over with this year for the out years because we're going to need it two years from now? So I'm opposing this amendment, not the technical part but the sunset part. I think we ought to just sunset it, period, as you would