

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 17, 2005

LB 312

lean, mean, and a twenty-first century fighting economic development machine. What's the promise in this tier? The promise is not to maintain jobs. Now that's the problem with the tier. If you don't like that, I would understand that. I know that qualm. But economic development is not simply creating jobs. It is also creating healthy businesses. Healthy businesses will stay here longer, spend...put down tap roots and be long-term citizens, in my estimation. Allowing them to be...to not just be satisfactory, but to be cutting edge, is a good thing. The promise that we're adding with this amendment is to make them promise something that they didn't set out to promise, we haven't asked them before to do this, and from my estimation, it's not the rationale as to why this tier exists. On the other hand, if I'm wrong, if the body out votes me, if you decide to choose this way, so be it. I will happily take the bill on to Final Reading, and do as this body suggests we do with respect to economic development. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Further discussion? Senator Raikes.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. Senator Landis makes several good points. A couple of things I would mention, though. It's my understanding, and we talked about this some in the committee, that this isn't necessarily equipment that is immobile. So a company could buy \$30 million of equipment from China, put it in a plant in Nebraska, and it's movable. I mean, maybe it's computers, I don't know. So as soon as the period is past that we...the incentives are...the credits are collected, they're on the road, or at least the threat is back--either you give us something, or we're out of here, we're leaving the state. The second thing is, fewer jobs--and Senator Landis made a point about that, industrializing and so on--they don't have to be any better jobs. You can, in fact, have fewer worse jobs. And maybe that's something that...and I would agree that we certainly want to tolerate it in the state. If a company makes that decision, we're not going to file charges and run them out of the state. They can be here. The question here, though, is whether you give them tax breaks to do something like that. And I think that's a different question. I think when it comes to