

February 23, 1995 LB 829

on a...on an economic development package. You know, it's good for discussion but I encourage the body not to agree to the Wickersham amendment because when we do get into the Education Committee on those bills there will be a thorough discussion based on the committee hearings and the input of the public in the Legislature in what the real future should be. Many of the proposals out there actually talk about an income factor, an income weight in the formula, whereas we would get into the actual discussion on not only the amount of taxable valuation in a district that a district has on a resource side but also their ability to pay, based on the income side. And those particular types of combinations are going to be the network, I think, of which the future of the income tax rebate will develop around. I would hate to see the Legislature make future policy at this time on the Select File amendment. That's why I put this particular amendment up to kind of slow the body down and say, wait a minute, I'm not sure this is what we want to do. By the way, if, in fact, we do agree to the Wickersham amendment, then I am going to have to get more serious on it and I have then written already, ready to go, three or four different proposals that would be, I think, even better than the Wickersham proposal we have now. This is not the time for those discussions. It's going to be at the time that we have the debate on those bills this year as they come out of committee and as they're on the floor. So I would urge...I'll keep the amendment up there simply for discussion purposes, but I would urge at some point and remind the body that I will pull this amendment and I would urge the...not the body that they do not agree with the Wickersham amendment at this time, it's the wrong place and the wrong time.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. For discussion on the Bernard-Stevens amendment, Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, Madam Chair and members of the body, Senator Wickersham, so we don't run into the same problem we did last night, let me make a proposal to you. Let's work the math together, if we could here, so we come to the right answer, and make sure I understand what it is you're doing. Let's assume, for purposes of argument, that we have a company with a 100 million dollar annual payroll moving into the state, as I understand the provisions of LB 829, that company would then be eligible, assuming it's \$100 million over a ten-year...the ten-year period, that that company each year would be eligible to receive 3.7, using your 3.7 number from last night, or we'll