

April 11, 1983

LB 560

live and some states address that. I think the philosophy argument is the main argument. I don't believe to go through a series of amendments that will be coming up here are going to do anything towards helping us to establish that philosophy in this body. I would urge you very much to defeat the Newell amendment.

PRESIDENT: We are discussing the Newell amendment. Is there further discussion on the Newell amendment? Senator Newell, do you want to close?

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, the opposition is not unexpected. I want to say to Senator Wesely, however, in my humble opinion he is incorrect. I think much of his district could be designated substandard and parts of his district might even be designated blighted. But that is not the issue here. The issue here is whether we are going to try to provide employment opportunities for some social purpose or whether, in fact, this proposal is aimed and directed at just offering business an additional opportunity to write off taxes. Now if the introducers...if that is not the intent of the introducers, if it is in fact the intent of the introducers to encourage bringing in jobs to deal with the problems of unemployment in the state, then they ought to be adopting this amendment, and since two of the introducers have indicated that that is not their desire, that they are in fact opposed, then I think that we have somewhat exposed the intent and purpose of this bill. I would very much urge this Legislature to adopt this amendment. It will provide jobs where the unemployment is greatest and, frankly, this is the way that most of the job credits proposals have at least some part of it aimed in this direction. Most of the other states have, in fact, used this sort of mechanism to target it. It is called, it is in keeping with President Reagan's urban enterprise zones. It is an expanded urban enterprise proposal. It would open it up wider than those areas that would be incorporated under President Reagan's enterprise zone bill and, in fact, frankly, it is kind of wide open in that regard. It is, however, substantially tighter than the way the sponsors of this bill have written it, because as I expressed earlier I don't believe it is the intent to encourage or deal with the unemployment problem. It is the intent quite the contrary to make sure that we have additional corporate tax breaks to go along with those that the Reagan administration provided with the Economic Recovery Act of 1981. Those accelerated appreciation and those kinds of proposals have done very well, and it is one of the reasons