

February 22, 1995 LB 830

public purposes, public uses and public purposes which the Legislature intends that the act will help accomplish. Well, that's the irony of the thing. If the intent is to have ad valorem taxes on new investment, the whole function of the bill is to not have ad valorem taxes apply, but, in fact, to have them apply to the prepping of the area and the purchase of the area and all the other things that go along with tax-increment financing. So indeed, the idea is to eliminate the substandard blighted conditions but the act itself doesn't meet the intent of that subsection (5) I think, or at least that would be my concern. Now Senator Chambers is trying to eliminate that as well as some other elements so I don't particularly support the Chambers amendment, but it would seem to me that if the intent is to get ad valorem taxes, at least in terms of the intent language, the bill itself does not accomplish that goal. Just thought it would be ironic to point that out.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Chambers, there are no further lights. Would you like to close on your amendment?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, I will withdraw my amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Chambers. He asked to withdraw. No objections? So ordered. Now we're back to the Withem amendment. Any further discussion on the Withem amendment? Seeing none, Senator Withem, would you like to close?

SPEAKER WITHEM: I'll simply close on the amendment and urge you to adopt it. This tends to...I think...I evidently did not understand the degree to which people felt about this amendment, but I do think it is an offering towards those who had objections to the original intent language in the bill and I think it moves in that direction. I would urge you to support it.

SENATOR CROSBY: You've heard the closing. The question is the adoption of the Withem amendment. All in favor vote aye, opposed no. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of Senator Withem's amendment.