

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 19, 2003

LB 608

So that the idea of replacing that bill, which has, I think, has a troubled future, with this amendment is fair with me because in the end we will replace a program that we're now spending someplace between 3 and 4.5 million dollars a year on with a better program that is capped and can't get us in trouble economically, but has significantly better opportunity for incentive. It is true it is a refundable credit. In other words, a company who makes these investments but makes no income the next year will be able to get the refund for what they've done, but they will have employed people, and that's what we need...you need to make that happen. You don't have to make income to get a refundable credit out of this program. That's one of the reasons it would be an incentive, because it will be a reliable...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...outcome that a business would know when they made the application.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis and Senator Bourne. Mr. Clerk, item?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Smith would move to amend Senator Bromm's amendment with AM2006. (Legislative Journal page 1928.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Smith,...

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you...

SENATOR CUDABACK: ...to open on your amendment.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, AM2006 obviously amends the Bromm amendment, AM2005. Senator Bromm pointed out that this benefit package would go to counties with 25,000 population or less and, in evaluating who that would affect and not affect, you know, it is...has become apparent that the 25,000 population was a number that was arrived at and unintentionally it was an arbitrary number. And the reality of that is that smaller towns within a county with towns such as Scottsbluff, North Platte, Fremont, Norfolk, South Sioux, I'm