

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

May 19, 2003

LB 608

supporting both those amendments. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Erdman. Senator Burling, you're recognized to speak.

SENATOR BURLING: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to ask Senator Bromm some questions, if he would yield.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Senator Bromm, would you yield to a question?

SPEAKER BROMM: Yes.

SENATOR BURLING: Thank you. We'll let Senator Landis off the hook a little bit and see if we can get some questions answered here. Could you help me? Remind me, Senator Bromm, of the criteria for LB 270 and why we're suggesting to replace it?

SPEAKER BROMM: The criteria for LB 270, I believe, was two employees. Where's George when I need him? The criteria, the old criteria for LB 270, two jobs and \$75,000 of investment, no application, simply take it on your tax return when you fill out your tax return for the credit.

SENATOR BURLING: Thank you. Now was that not being used?

SPEAKER BROMM: Well, it is being used, but the impact, because of the way that it works, seems to be negligible as far as encouraging any economic development, and I think it was rarely used in any rural settings at all, but used in jobs and businesses that would expand anyway, regardless of...without LB 270 they would have expanded. It's sort of an afterthought.

SENATOR BURLING: Okay. Thank you very much. I'm going to support the Smith amendment because I think it goes in the direction that I have concerns for, and that is you have two companies investing the same amount of money, hiring the same number of employees, same salary level, but because one is located in this county they cannot receive tax incentives, and the other company is located in another county, they can. That seems to be, to me, to be discriminatory, and when you start drawing lines you can't avoid those kind of things. But for