

the year the investment was made. And that was not the intent of that...of LB 270 when it was originally passed and introduced by Senator Chizek. Just a quick aside on the other bill, on Senator McFarland's bill. Clearly there was debate, there was long debate, and I remember clearly Senator Johnson talking about the Goodyear example and the problem where if you make a \$20 million investment and if you...if employees are laid off do you still get the tax credit. We talked about it over and over again. There are two sides to LB 775, the investment side and the employment side and both are valuable. So I think we were consistent with our debate in 1987 by the vote we just had on LB 435. Even though we need to always look at it and be aware of problems I don't think drastic changes are necessary. But on LB 270 the problem is it wasn't working. We want these tax credits to be positive, to work, and if they're not working, if they're not encouraging investment like they were originally intended to do then we make the changes we need to...why have 270 if the investment part of it is not working properly? I'd just as soon repeal the whole thing, if it's not working. So I think that the amendment that Senator Landis is offering is somewhat I realize to be consistent with the vote on the prior bill, however it is not consistent because LB 775, in my opinion, is working generally. LB 270 is not working to its capability and that's why I've offered the bill which is part of this amendment, the averaging provision. So with that I would urge the body to reject the Landis amendment and vote the bill across. Thank you.

**SPEAKER BARRETT:** Thank you. Before recognizing Senator Landis for additional discussion, the Chair is pleased to announce that in the north balcony we have representatives of the Council of Catholic Women from across the state and their chairman. Would you people please stand and be recognized by your Legislature. Thank you, we're very happy to have you with us this morning. Senator Landis, followed by Senators Hall and Wesely.

**SENATOR LANDIS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. Senator Smith asked for just a little more explanation about what Section 4 entails. Section 4 is the way you figure an LB 270 credit, what you have to do to get the credit. Currently it's been interpreted that you've got to have these two employees for the entire year. This new language reduces that responsibility to have basically an average increase over time. I'm sorry, not an average increase over time, but if there are two employees at the end of the year