

will support Senator Hall's amendment. I'm not so concerned about the pat on the back as I am the tap of the pocket of those who are left to pay whatever amount of revenue that we use as enhancement for...or loss of revenue for enhancement to attract business. I'm not too sure but what we spend, I don't know, I had a note here, half our time we raise taxes and the other half our time we spend here trying to figure what we're going to exempt. I may not have the percentages right but I have that distinct feeling that that's the route we go and as I am looking at the handout from Senator Wesely that started out only in 1983 \$150 per 100,000 investment and now we're going to only talk about 1,500 per 75,000, I'm not sure what that percentage change but it's substantial and it's indicative of what will always occur with these incentive programs. You know they're going to grow. You're going to lower the threshold to qualify. We're going to increase over time the credit and the net result is only one thing and that, of course, is fewer pockets to pull the funds out of for the support of government. While I say that, I want to make it very plain, well, I did not support either 270 or 775 and I can hardly think of any of those that I have of incentive type programs that I have supported, I would be the first to grant and acknowledge that there is no question in my mind that there has been a significant change in attitudes on the part of a lot of people in Nebraska because of the passage of those acts. That doesn't, however, offset my philosophical opposition to attempting to do on the revenue side a targeting which is just virtually, as a practical matter, virtually impossible to do. And if you want to make target of the system to attract certain types of expansion, it's much more feasible to do within at least to the extent the Constitution will permit to do on the appropriation side because then you can really tell where it's going and what that impact is and you've got a measurement that is just virtually impossible on the revenue side. In fact, I probably would go so far as to say that probably the strength of LB 270 was the fact that it was used so little, didn't have much impact on adversely affecting revenue and, from my viewpoint, that's an advantage rather than a disadvantage as far as overall tax structure. But it seems to me we're going to be dealing with this session and I'm sure in future sessions the same old story of no place to stop. Each...each incentive begets another incentive and each effort to level the playing field will only be leveled in one way and that will be to expand, not to reduce incentives. And I think that the long term public policy will be adverse although I would freely acknowledge that there has been some immediate