

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

May 19, 2003

LB 608

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I have suggested to Senator Beutler that in a moment he offer a kill motion which would allow us to lay it over for a day. I think every one of us thinks, gosh, you know, we haven't had a lot of time here. One of the things I think we want to talk about is the impact of what this does to the green sheet. From my best guess, I think we'd do better by the green sheet if we were to pass this than not, but I need to learn that. Don't know for sure. And I don't think we want to do something today that gave us any prejudice. This program would cost. The Bromm amendment has a program that costs less than the program it would replace. That should be good for us. The Bromm amendment has a program which is capped so we know how much it costs, and it can't cost more because it surprises it, and in this time and place that would be good for us. This program does deepen the incentive and make it a refundable credit, but that is exactly what's necessary to make the program effective. Our current program is not effective and we're spending \$4 million a year and we're getting nothing for it. I happen to trust Al Wenstrand when he says this is a genuine incentive and has an opportunity or a chance to work. The program that we replace, that we now have, has no wage limitation. This has a wage limitation. I think that's a wise idea. I don't think \$8.25 is too low; I don't think it's too high. I think it's okay. I can live with it. So I see it as a policy advancement. The fight on LB 608, which by the way is by no means over, is over terms right now that I think are almost as much a step forward and a step back simultaneously. And so to take steps which are only positive, from my perspective, is better than the fight on LB 608 as it is now done. I'm promised a fight to lower the wage level. I'm promised terms on disclosure, which I don't want in the bill and were written not by me or any supporter of the bill. I'd rather do without those. So I...this is a legitimate deal from my perspective and the reason is it leaves me with two things which I like. First, it does away with LB 270 as it is now structured, because I don't think there's a dime's worth of incentive in the program and we're spending 4 million bucks a year to do it. And secondly, it replaces it with a program for which our economic development director says has real incentive power for rural Nebraska, and I think that's legitimate. And those are two things I'm prepared to do, and I get to do them in