

and I think this body has drawn the line. As I said a couple of years ago, this very same proposal with some modifications, obviously it has been amended since then, was killed by this body, recognizing the overall problem. Now here is the irony of the whole situation. What you're trying to do with LR 11CA in bringing this concept of tax breaks and incentives down to the local level is you encounter what I think the mood is within the...within the state. I think there is a lot of concern about LB 775, a lot of concern about the tax breaks and the fairness of them and the efficiency of them and the effectiveness of them and what you're doing is you're ignoring, I think, that public sentiment on the state level and bringing that on down to the local level and they may not see it now, but some day they will, that...that these sort of incentives and changes in tax code instead of a fair, across-the-board system, to one in which you have this community or that community providing this break or that break. You have greater difficulty even yet and so the public that is concerned about this sort of policy is going to see it compounded by bringing it down to the local level and it's on that basis that I think the people would generally not be favorable to this sort of a change. At the same time I understand that there have been caveats put into this amendment that the local city councils would have to take a vote, that people would have to take a vote that they would be involved in it. But I think what would happen is you'd have undue pressures if one city would take the step of providing this sort of a break, that city down the road will have to do the same, just as this state has had to have this and that tax break because Iowa had it or Kansas has had it. You would have an inevitable domino effect in this area by having every city feeling like they have to keep up with the competition, and so, yes, you'd have that local control, but in fact, you wouldn't. In fact, you'd have a situation where if certain cities would move forward you would have other cities following simply to keep up and then everybody across the state would have these same sort of tax breaks and again, issues about fairness and equity, efficiency and effectiveness would all come up. In addition, I think for those of you supporting this from the smaller towns, the Norfolks and what have you, and even smaller into the David Citys and Wahoos, you, I think, should recognize what I feel is that the bigger the town, the bigger the opportunity to provide incentive to attract industry, that you will probably further assist the urban areas at the expense of the rural areas, that you will further divide the state city versus city, but you will also further divide on urban-rural grounds in my estimation