May 11, 2005          LB 425

38 ayes, 3 nays, Mr. President, on the amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK:    AM1470 has been adopted.    I do raise the
call.    And, members, while we're on this subject, I do
appreciate when somebody wants a record vote such as this to
speak up.  It's difficult for me to hear, or whosoever in the
Chair, at times, so just don't be afraid to let your voice be
heard.  Appreciate it.  Thank you.  Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:   Mr. President, the next amendment, Senator Bourne,
FA216.

SENATOR CUDABACK:  Senator Bourne, to open on your amendment to
LB 425.

SENATOR BOURNE:  Thank you, Mr. President, members.  I'd like to
substitute AM1570 for FA216, please.    (Legislative Journal
page 1476.)

SENATOR CUDABACK:  No objection.  So ordered.

SENATOR BOURNE:    Thank you, Mr. President, members.  Stay with
me, if you will, this is kind of a confusing subject.  You might
recognize it. On General File Senator Mines ran an amendment
that would have restored the MIRF money through 2009.  What my
amendment does is add back $2.4 million, which is one year of
MIRF money, but it places it in the state aid to municipalities
fund.   So it increased the state aid to the municipalities fund
by $2.4 million for one year.    And the reason that I am
advocating or doing...advocating doing this is that there are
many cities in our state that budgeted for the comeback, for
lack of a better word, of the MIRF money.  And by that I mean,
in 2003, and I'm going to read through the transcripts of the
floor debate a little bit, in 2003 there was some confusion, in
that a number of us thought we were voting to eliminate MIRF for
two years, with the exception of 520-some-odd thousand dollars
for the city of Lincoln so they could satisfy a bond obligation.
And then the understanding was is that MIRF would be eliminated
for two years, would come back in 2005, now, and continue on
through 2009.  So a number of cities, including my own, budgeted
based on that premise, on that thought that the money would be