

examined time and time again, and I rise in support of LB 559 as it is currently drafted. The time, point in time in the future, if on Select File the amendment shows up that says, hey, we are going to roll this all into one year, and if it is good policy...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...today for purposes of adopting this proposal, then it ought to be good policy to be put in place without the three year implementation, that is when I say, well, then Senator Wesely is probably right. Maybe we ought to come back and reexamine, rethink the Wesely amendment, merely because we haven't given ourselves the time to adjust and look at how we have to make changes if necessary, the changes that Senator Beutler spoke to of possibly adjusting the corporate income tax, if the impact is greater than we predict through the fiscal note that is in LB 559. But in terms of the tax policy on this issue, I don't necessarily disagree with it, and I think it makes good sense. I don't think anybody is going to move out of the state on this issue. I think that...that's, and it is interesting that it is on green paper, because it is a moldy argument as far as I am concerned for purposes of these kinds of measures. They are either good tax policy or they are not. In this case, I think LB 559...

SENATOR CROSBY: Time.

SENATOR HALL: ...as structured is good tax policy and I would urge you to oppose the Wesely amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Hudkins. Senator Hudkins wants to speak on the bill. Okay, Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES: Madam President and members of the body, I rise in opposition of the Wesely amendment, and I don't think we should have a sunset on it, because I think we are setting a level playing field right now, so I think we should stay with it. But getting back to the bill just a minute, I would like to ask Senator Brashear one more question, if he wouldn't mind.

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Senator Jones.