

ever to that is you have to take it away from somebody. The way that amendment is written it is going to continue and the only way you're ever going to...the state is ever going to raise the sales tax is to take it away from someone and and that's what I have always opposed in this deal. A permanent giving away of the state's sales tax basically is something I have vehemently opposed. That's why I floated several ideas in the last several months about how to get to the Omaha proposal because, one, I think the Omaha proposal is the right thing to do. I have worked with Senator Ashford on the Nebraskaplex and building a large arena in west Omaha is not the right thing for Omaha at this point in time, I believe. I think that the move being made in the Omaha community is the right move though I'm not wild about how they plan to pay for it. But having said that, I'm of the opinion that as long as this body in 1994 does nothing to permanently give that sales tax base away, I'm willing to give that a shot to try and address that need in Omaha. But anything over 12 months I think fails the temporary test. It's that simple. Because I think a year from now this body is going to have a major decision to make. I guess the one thing I am willing to do is to postpone it for a year. A year from now this body is going to have to make a decision on sales tax. It's going to have to raise it to solve our budget problems, it's going to have to raise it to solve our property tax problem. I guarantee you're going to have to do something to deal with those next year because if it doesn't happen in '94, if you don't deal with it in '95 or '96 they're going to do something for you out there and so a year from now you're going to have to make that decision. And I guess I have felt that the people in the City of Omaha, though I would prefer another financing mechanism, have voted for this and as long as it doesn't impede on this Legislature's ability to address the sales tax rate next year, I'm willing to give it a try. But anything like Senator Landis's amendment I would vehemently oppose, and would kill the bill. I'm not going to join anybody's filibusters because I've never done that and I'm not going to do it this year, but I'd vehemently oppose the bill. But I think the way it is structured now this body has all the cards in its hands a year from now on what they're going to do and as long as it keeps all the cards in its hands I guess I'm going to trust the body to do that. I think it's perfectly clear though when you look at the 1981 article. Everything in the past was for permanent projects or permanent funding source for the City of Omaha. This is a different animal, I think. I've been led to believe that the people involved in this, at