March 23, 1982

the bottom line, that I see no justification to subsidize for a period beyond fifteen years which is already permitted. To go to twenty-five makes no sense at all. I yield ten seconds of my time to Senator Beutler since it was reopened.

PRESIDENT: All right, Senator Beutler, and then that will do it. We will then conclude our close.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Just in response to Senator Goodrich's question, another way that it erodes the tax base is the tax increment financing makes the assumption that the project that is funded by tax increment financing would not otherwise be built but that is a false assumption. An office building, many commercial buildings, many types of buildings are going to be built whether there is tax increment financing or not and when they are built they are taxed. So there is a false assumption in just saying that the only tax base we had was the low tax base and so there is no loss. There is a loss because most of those projects, to some extent, maybe not to the same extent, but most of those projects would be built anyway and they would be taxed and they would share in the tax burden. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: All right the question is the motion to return LB 672 to strike the enacting clause. It's for the motion of an amendment to strike the enacting clause. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. I remind all the members we are on Final Reading. You're supposed to be at your desks and I don't suppose everybody is there because not everybody is voting. Senator Warner, do you wish to do anything? Record the vote.

CLERK: 17 ayes, 24 nays on the motion to return the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Motion failed. Any other motions?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wesely would move to return the bill to Select File for a specific amendment. The Wesely amendment would strike "25" and insert "20".

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'll try and be very brief. We've discussed this matter quite at length. It's clear from the vote that we just had there is a lot of opposition to this legislation and it needs 30 votes to go on the ballot. I would like to offer a compromise that 25 is far too long but 20 makes a lot more sense if we're going to have to extend it and I would be willing to

9392