

of the 1059 formula, so we would have to be coming back and discussing it and changing that anyway, and so I don't think we're setting anything in stone by recognizing that we would do this in the future. So, with that, I, until I hear something different to change my mind, I continue to support Senator Wickersham's amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President. First, I want to respond to a couple of things because they were so peculiar, and then really come back to what I think the essence of the argument is. The discussion by Senator Bernard-Stevens, and, Senator, please don't take this as an offensive remark, but I think that's about as red herring as I've ever seen, because obviously if the Education Committee chooses to do something with the income tax rebate, I think the discussion of LB 829 will be relatively fresh on our minds and I can't imagine that, with the assistance of the committee counsel, that we won't be able to somehow conform whatever changes we might suggest, if any, to the income tax rebate to whatever we might do now with the Micron bill. And, as you know, Senator, the issue of the income tax rebate has been in the past a hotly contested issue. There have been other efforts to modify it and those have always been unsuccessful. If you have been able to look into your crystal ball and tell us in some wisdom or certainty what we're going to do, I will be pleased to hear about it. But I'm not at all confident that we will do anything at all, even though one of the bills is my own and I'm not at all sure that I can get it out of committee, although I'll make an effort to do that, because I believe we do need to make changes in the income tax rebate, but if we make changes, they will easily follow what we do here. That is not a problem. The other unusual thing is that Senator Withem makes a calculation of how much this means in the total package to this company. I was a little bit surprised, a hundred million dollar payroll. He argues that it means about \$6 million to them. I don't know whether it's 6 million or some other number, but it's pretty small when you're that kind of a company. But let me tell you where it is a big number. It is a big number when it shows up in somebody else's property tax statement and that's where it will show up unless we adopt my amendment. It will show up in somebody's property tax statement and we will have property taxes in a school district paying for economic development. That does not