

SENATOR BECK: ...effect on their cities.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Beck, could you also explain to me why it would be...if, in fact, there is no real administrative cost to the bill in the majority of the cities, if...why it would be good to do it for one and yet not the others?

SENATOR BECK: Well, I will be very frank with you, Senator. We're certainly...my intent, if you look at the original bill, was to make it across the board, 1 percent to the state, 1 percent to the city. I felt that was a minimal amount, a modest amount, and that was fair. But, in looking it over and in turning it over to the committee, I think that we feel that perhaps the greater Nebraska reaction would have been harsh against it had it come to their own city and not without having the ability to serve...you know, to visit with all the senators on it, we felt perhaps that since we, in Omaha, were very much concerned about it that we would limit it to Omaha. But, again, I have always been willing to negotiate as long as I see money going back, private dollars going back into the community.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Beck. Senator Hall, would you yield to one final question?

SENATOR HALL: Yes.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Hall, would you be...at this point, do you think you might favor an amendment that would do the following, that would make the...eliminate the cities' tax collected across the board, however, would put in an option that if cities can justify what their administrative costs are on it and explain what they're doing and why they have administrative costs, to give them the option of still being able to collect the tax?

SPEAKER BARRETT PRESIDING

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: Would I? No, Senator Bernard-Stevens, because these...I'll tell you what, the issue has been debated now for approximately four years and to answer your question, the League has had...they have had the political muscle to keep that tax