

use those facilities because the passengers, themselves, will be the ones paying the fee. It will be passed on to them as well. It won't be just the issue of the company picking up the tab. And all this boils down to is money, as I...when I introduced the amendment back on, I think it was Select or General, I can't remember which now, it's been so long ago, but the issue was one of money. I said that the issue had not a public hearing. It didn't...as far as I was concerned, and I think many of the members felt the same way because I laid that out, it did not need a public hearing. What it was was simply a clarification of what we took to be the rule, that being that a quasi governmental entity, an Airport Authority could not charge a fee for the use of their driveways just for cars to come and go, not to park but for cars to come and go to have access, to drop off people and to pick up passengers. If that's the case, ladies and gentlemen, we are...if that ability lies there through that language that is currently in statute, then it is news to everyone who is out there. What we don't have is a prohibition from that. What has happened in the past is the Airport Authority has attempted to do this. They have talked about it. It has been addressed in their meetings. The amendment I offered simply would have clarified what was understood to be the standard and that being that there was not a fee to be charged. If the body chooses to return LB 126, the issue, I think, has to be one of understanding whether or not that's what we are doing. Are we affirmatively then saying we agree with the provisions that the Airport Authority does charge a fee? I don't think we do. I don't think that's what we're saying. And I know that through 126 all we are doing is prohibiting that from taking place for one year. If the case is made that the Airport Authority needs that ability in order to survive and they have an excellent facility in Omaha and it clearly is an Omaha issue, they should make their case then to this body to ask for the ability to do that. They have not done that at any time in the past. They just, because there is no provision that prevents that, have begun talking about it and are looking at this for a revenue source. It boils down to competition. It boils down to revenue and it means money. And I would argue that, at this point in time, there is...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...no reason to delay the advancement into law of LB 126. It is not some onerous provision that the Airport Authority, should they feel they need additional revenue, come