

advancement of the bill. Senator Beck.

SENATOR BECK: Thank you, Mr. President. As you could see, I was involved there with some other things. I'm sorry. Members of the body, I just wanted to add this to the discussion we've had this morning. We have been in conversations with the Department of Revenue from the State of Iowa. Now Iowa has a bill, has passed it in 1987, it was made effective in 1987, and they have some rather telling figures on what this kind of bill did. It's...their bill is structured more intricately than this one, because in theirs they give not only a deduction, but they give a tax credit of sorts. The only figures that they could give us, and they called just a few minutes ago, and I wanted to bring this material out to put your mind at ease, because going around, I think, in some minds is the fact that, oh my, this is going to cost the State of Nebraska a tremendous amount of money, and they're worried about that, even though others here this morning ably have argued that this would not be the case. And Tim's material, Senator Hall's material that was sent out to you, again I think, supports that. But as a little piece of additional support I'd just like to share this with the body and enter it into the record, and that is that in 1987, when Iowa made this kind of bill effective, those who were afraid of it were projecting the cost at 1.5 million to the State of Iowa. They were very concerned. But they found that actually at the very most that it only cost, in essence, 524,000. But the telling argument here is not the actual dollars that were not received through the deduction, but it was the bulk of money was returned to one segment of the population, the...the...I think it was half...two-thirds. The bulk of the money was given over to the population who fell from...fell within the zero to \$25,000 range. And who needs tax relief more than those people in that range. And this is what the State of Iowa has found, and their bill has had no constitutional problems or anything of this kind. I just wanted to share that with the body as another telling argument for the real reason that we should advance LB 346, because the people who received the benefit, the greater share of the benefit were those who really receive it. And I think that just supports and furthers Senator Abboud's argument that this is tax relief and it's necessary for these folks. And, again, I just want to reiterate, I think it falls within the realm of fairness, and certainly we can see that. And we're going to continue our conversations with the Department of Revenue of Iowa, but they have given us those...that material this morning, and I just really want the body to think about