

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Before I introduce the next speaker, there are a few guests. Senator Janssen has a guest under the south balcony, Jan Larsen from Fremont. And Senator Stuhr has a guest under the south balcony as well, Nicholas Powland from Pleasant Dale. Would you both please rise and be recognized by the Legislature. Thank you for coming today. Senator Bromm, your light is next on the Bernard-Stevens amendment to the McKenzie amendment.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to oppose the Bernard-Stevens amendment and I've been involved in another discussion here and I hope that I'm not repetitive. My concern is that with economic development bills that are successful and that the Legislature has utilized in the past, they've made a commitment, a policy commitment that has gone beyond the term of this particular session, certainly has been alluded to here on the floor, 775, Micron. These are commitments to entice companies over the long term. Now, I don't understand, if we have total confidence that we're going to do this, where this concern is coming from that's being stressed by Senator Bernard-Stevens with regard to this amendment. If in two years or four years someone introduces a law and they want to change what is in 377, they have every right to do that, every right to do that. Right now we fund economic development incentives with taxes that we don't collect or we collect and return. That doesn't go through the Legislature every year. That doesn't go through the appropriations process. If the Micron bills are used, we're not going to come in here and reapprove that every time they refund income tax dollars for training for jobs. What is the difference? The only difference is that the money is income tax in the Micron situation and this is General Fund dollars but the income tax would have become General Fund dollars had we kept them. There is no difference. I don't think we need to split hairs on this bill at this point in time. There's been a lot of work, a lot of effort gone into this bill. The people that should be most concerned about it who have plants in their districts have not necessarily all agreed on the approach to funding this, but we're where we're at. It's a reasonable solution, and now to back up and erode the confidence that I had in the bill because of the way it's structured and others, I just don't think that the body ought to do that. And the only reason to do it that I can see is that there are people who apparently are soft on providing these funds, and if they're soft on providing these funds, you know they might as well plan