

guests of the Legislature, we have from Senator Crosby's District, 120 eighth graders from Pound Middle School in Lincoln, along with a number of teachers, and they are all in the north balcony. Would you all stand please. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment I have is by Senator Beutler. Senator, I have AM2421 in front of me. I understand you would like to withdraw 2421 and offer AM2490. (See page 2502 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Beutler is requesting a unanimous consent for substitution. Is there an objection? Hearing none, Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Withem, members of the Legislature, I hope you all will take a serious look at this particular amendment because the objective of the amendment is to kill two birds with one stone. I intend to vote for the throwback, for 559, in whatever form it comes out of this debate, assuming that it grants no greater benefits than what are currently granted in the bill. However, it seems to me that there is a logic to delaying for one year the granting of the benefits for the purpose of funding the Campaign Finance Reform Act. The Campaign Finance Reform Act, as you all know, is an act that is in place, that is going to be affecting all of you next year, that we've committed to, and it is an act that needs just a one-time shot of money. It doesn't need a continuing appropriation. A one-year delay in this bill relieves the General Fund, in a sense, that you are not exempting out \$1.6 million. So what this amendment says is delay those benefits for one year, maintain the same structure of 559, but delay the benefits for one year and the money that is then saved is appropriated out of the General Fund to the Campaign Finance Reform Fund. Okay. As you know, the throwback rule essentially is saying that with respect to certain kinds of income, these companies are paying no state taxes whatsoever to any state. And you and I know that from an equity point of view, this doesn't make any sense at all. It's totally unfair. They are getting a break that the other companies do not get. However, for reasons that we all understand, we have to grant that break. The reason is we don't want these people going elsewhere and expanding their businesses elsewhere, or even taking their existing companies elsewhere. So we need to do it for that reason. However, I think from prior debate and from everything