

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

May 21, 2003

LB 608

about LB 775. We didn't have any public hearing or anything related to LB 270, so we shouldn't be doing that either. So I would simply suggest that we repeal LB 270 altogether, which I think was Senator Landis' original idea, and go on from there next year. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. You've heard the opening on AM2052. Open for discussion. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I made a mistake in answering to a question by Senator Beutler. And I wanted to correct myself. And also, I think I misunderstood the question. The LB 270 repeal was in the green copy of the bill. I was asked if any part of the Bromm amendment was in the green copy, and it wasn't. But there is a part of it that is, and that is the repeal of LB 270. So I...in fact, I didn't accurately answer. LB 270 was in the green copy of the bill. It was reported out by the committee. And to the extent that that is part of the Bromm amendment, then it was in the green copy of the bill, and I answered mistakenly. I support the repeal of LB 270. I also think that there was an idea for rural development that was originally in a number of the bills, and was offered as an amendment to this, which was to lower the standards for LB 775, 20 employees, 15 employees, \$1 million investment, \$2 million investment, making it easier to get LB 775 benefits, and doing less, and then not paying taxes for 15 years. I think this is a much better approach than that. I think it's also targeted. And I happen to like this approach better. So I'm going to vote no. And the reason is, although I support the repeal of LB 270, it will leave us with the, what do we do about rural development, agenda. And the preferred solution up until this time was, ask less for LB 775 companies, which is, I think, a very bad alternative. This is, I think, a much better alternative than that. Take this off the table, we go back to the LB 270 repeal, it's true. But the desire for rural economic development then comes down to, how can I get 15 years of paying no taxes by ponying up less than we're now asking for LB 775? And gosh, that I really don't want. This is a very liveable result for me, which is why I'll be opposing the Beutler amendment. Thank you.