

providing job training types of programs and other sorts of employee benefits for these companies that reach the 500 new employees, 50 million dollar investment level. Operationally, the way this would work would be that most of us either are or have been employees of a company some time in our lives, at least since the mid-1960s when Nebraska had an income tax. The way that operates is that when the employee gets the paycheck there's a pay stub with that indicating that a portion of that individual's gross income has been withheld for purposes of paying state income taxes. Then, on a quarterly basis, the company is responsible for sending that withholding into the state and the state then credits that, it goes into the General Fund and it's used to pay for state government projects. On these projects that qualify, that have received approval from the board, we've talked about what the board is, meet these qualifying levels that are a part of our economic development strategy, the monies that will still be withheld from the employee's paycheck but the money, rather than going to the state General Fund, will be recirculated back to provide worker benefits which will be job training and this job training can be done with contract with the community colleges or with the university or with other individuals, or other employee benefits. This is another one of those...and, again, I...Senator Wesely thought I might have been a little harsh on him before when I was making reference to the 775 arguments and all of those sort of things. The fact that he's not on the floor now I can say something nice about him, I guess. I do understand that there are those individuals who do not feel that states ought to be participating in this incentive driven economic development competition that we're involved with, and it's a very sincere position that some people have. On the other hand, if you believe that we should be competing, as I do, I believe that it is essential that we compete, we have to be in a position when a company like Micron or Pfizer, or like any of these other companies come along and indicate that they would like to consider locating in a company but that it must be economically beneficial to that company to make that transition, we have to compete in the same arenas. When we passed 775, we were in the lead in the terms of general tax incentives for relocation of companies. I think we learned a lot from 775. We're not making some of those same mistakes again in LB 829. In those eight years though, we found in certain areas, such as the ability to provide site improvements and site acquisition costs, we are not competitive any longer and that's why we're needing to pass LB 830. In the area of providing worker benefit