

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

May 21, 2003

LB 608

components are in our amendment also. The wages component, the idea of having a level of investment, the idea of having a minimum number of employees, having three years' commitment to stay on the project. I mean, certainly we could wait and do this after a bill next year. But...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SPEAKER BROMM: ...you've been here a long time, and I've been here awhile, and we all know that we don't always have...some of these ideas develop when bills are on the floor and we're in the process of discussing them. And I think this is a good idea for rural Nebraska to try. And in the straits that we're in, in our economy, I think it would be very, very unfortunate not to do it. But certainly we all have to do what we think we need to do, and so I understand that. But I strongly urge that we do not adopt this amendment, and that we do proceed with this, what I think is a little bit of a novel idea to try to help rural Nebraska. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you, President Cudaback and members. I'm going to sort of lay out where I am from a rural standpoint, as a rural senator on the Revenue Committee. We advanced, of course, the committee amendments for the bill when we advanced this out. And we had stricken LB 270 provisions out of the bill, it was not in committee amendments, for the trade-off that we would lower the threshold in the rural counties to qualify for LB 775. It seemed to work, made sense to me as a rural Senator. When we stripped that all out, and where we are now, I stand in support of the Bromm amendment, because I think it's foolish not to do something for the rural sector out there now that we are not doing. And that's why I support where we are. We had lowered the threshold in LB 775. And we eliminated all that in the committee amendments. Now with the Bromm amendment, I have to stand in support of what we're doing. It does provide...there's a wage component in it, a minimum wage, various stipulations that if they don't meet the criteria or maintain the criteria after three years, then they have to pay back the various incentives. So I think it's a good compromise,