

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, members of the body, I rise to oppose the Lamb amendment but it is a very curious amendment, Senator Lamb. You know yesterday it was so very important to have everything sunset about July 1, 1983, for some very curious reason. Now many of us know that curious reason but you see, yesterday when Senator Lamb offered his amendment he did something that the Omaha delegation has never been able to do by itself. He created a sense of unity, a sense of unity that we have never seen before. Senator Lamb did that because basically what has happened is there has been this game and the game has been tie it, hold them and milk them. Now I never knew there were that many cows in the urban area but that's what they have been trying to do, and so they dropped the amendment. Senator Lamb withdrew his amendment and we withdrew our amendments. Remember the great drama, and we voted on the advancement of LB 40. No one in this body, including myself thought LB 40 would pass. It certainly wasn't Howard Lamb. He didn't drop those amendments because he wanted to see the bill advance, because he voted against it, and so did ten Senators who previously supported it. You see, what was happening there was we wanted to kind of bring them all together. Now I oppose this amendment because we are supposed to be talking about doing a study. We are going to do this great Revenue study that has been so important throughout this session, a study that Senator Schmit said was absolutely necessary, and I know Senator Schmit is going to vote against this, and I know Senator Peterson is going to vote against this, and I know that Senator Hefner is going to vote against this. I know that there is going to be a lot of opposition from the rural areas to this kind of proposal because we need to look at the tax structure, and I want to be with that opposition. In fact, if this comes off, I want to be in opposition to 284, because I think we have to look at this whole thing. There has been a lot of talk about how the urban areas are taking the money and running. Well, I want you to know this is not fifty-fifty, it is not eighty-twenty, it is not ninety-ten, it is straight valuation. We want full circle and basically that is where we are at. It is exactly what Johnny had originally. And so what is happening here is a big full circle situation. I oppose this amendment. I think it is absolutely necessary that we look at this again. I think this has to be rewritten. Maybe we need revenue sharing. Maybe we don't. Maybe revenue sharing should exclude the city sales taxes. Maybe it shouldn't. But, you know,