

SENATOR LANDIS: That's right.

SENATOR HALL: If that stays in place and that system continues to work like that, why wouldn't it need to be on into the future? Why would January of 1995 there no longer be a need to replenish the Cash Reserve Fund?

SENATOR LANDIS: The reason being this is not a permanent downturn. This is a cash flow problem, not a permanent deficit, therefore, once you get over the cash flow problem, you are in a revenue neutral situation. You borrow in the short term, you have to pay back that short term so you can get the start-up of the operation, but once the operation is up and running it is revenue neutral and does not need to continue to draw on the Cash Fund or on this source of revenue.

SENATOR HALL: And...

SENATOR CONWAY PRESIDING

SENATOR CONWAY: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...what numbers do you have, Senator Landis, to base that time frame of that, the short term turnaround with regard to January 1 of 1995? Wouldn't it be better, in essence, to put it in place permanently and then have...if we don't need it when that upswing takes place, go ahead and repeal it? Or is this all the corporate community would agree to?

SENATOR LANDIS: Well, let me say that as somebody who approached the community, this is the only, all that was asked and I'll tell you why. To the best of our ability to predict, what we can identify as the cash flow problem, this amendment raises that amount of money which we predict we'll need to meet the cash flow obligations and to replenish the Cash Fund. We do not know of an additional need and for that reason did not ask for a permanent corporate filing increase because we meant to solve a particular and somewhat narrow problem.

SENATOR CONWAY: Time. Senator Schmit, you're next, please.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, as I recall, and I voted against it, but as I recall the tax that was included in LB 829 was supposed to be a temporary tax and, of course, when it came out, it turned out to be substantially greater than what