

less than 250.

SENATOR VRTISKA: I kept reading and I was trying to find out where it said that 75 percent went to less than those, and you say because it says just those, it doesn't refer to that, it just left it as a...

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Yeah,...

SENATOR VRTISKA: ...the fact that they're...

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: ...the language is creating new employment of less than 250, those...

SENATOR VRTISKA: Okay. Well, I had a hard time understanding that part of it. But I guess if that's...

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: We had a hard time writing it.

SENATOR VRTISKA: I thought you must have had. Appreciate that, thank you.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Okay.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, members. I rise in support of Senator Wickersham's amendment, but I recognize the issue that Senator Chambers raises, and I raise the same one as it relates to those businesses that are of the 101 to 250 employees that the amendment would allow for no more than 25 percent of the fund to be approved annually. The question is whether or not the issue ought to be addressed through grants. I can understand loans, and maybe that's an amendment for later on after this amendment is adopted, as Senator Wickersham pointed out, because this is an amendment to the amendment. But I believe that the basic purpose of the amendment, the language that it strikes and the insertion of this new language is a vast improvement over the bill as it currently exists. I would only have one question for Senator Wickersham. And I am in the same kind of position that Senator Chambers is in with regard to language that's in the amendment, there's no ability to address it through the offering of an amendment because it is already the second in line. But if Senator Wickersham would respond, my question is this, Senator Wickersham, on line 9 and we're in