

rational, normal business judgment to increase their investment and add employees, something that a business does when the time is right. But this bill gives them a pat on the back and, well, it's always been small enough and, gosh, seems that if we're going to do the 775 thing, let's do something for rural Nebraska so we put out this pat-on-the-back bill. Jerry Chizek had it and he brought it in at \$2,000. I think that was the number, wasn't it, LB 270? Put it down to \$1,000 with his approval on Select File, I think, when the bill was passed. There was some discussion but it was with his agreement ultimately to put it down to that level. What there has been no evidence of is that this bill at this level has motivated somebody to do an investment, to add employees they would not otherwise have added. What it is is a pat on the back. It's an admiralty from the State of Nebraska with a \$1,000 check alongside of it. Fair enough, all right, if you want to do that but if you're going to get the same action anyway, if you have no evidence that this spurs growth, if your jobs are added because in the normal free market enterprise system they're added when you've got something for them to do and you've got the cost of business that will justify it and you've got the budget that will justify it, you add your employees. If that's why you add employees rather than these tax credits and what they are are pats on the back and there is nothing to contradict that, why do you have to give a \$2,000 pat on the back or a \$1,500 pat on the back? It's the threshold as to who gets the pat on the back that you should worry about and that's in the bill untouched.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: Tim Hall hasn't changed or affected that number whatsoever. All we're talking about now is the size of the check the state writes out for people doing what they would profitably do on their own anyway. But we just increase the pat on the back to 1,500 bucks without any evidence whatsoever that this will make any difference other than cost the state more money. Not good enough. Not good enough. If this was ADC, would you do the same thing? Huh? No, wouldn't in a million years. You would have us down here fighting tooth and nail to show cost of living expenditures and budgets for housing and...you bet. Not in this case. No, in this case what we haven't done is we haven't given away enough money. That was the argument we heard. You know, the problem is with this program is we haven't given enough money away in the state...