bunch of business groups came in and said, no, no, no, that's not what was meant, that wasn't our intention. We've got to change LB 270. We've got to allow for an averaging system that would permit somebody to have less than for the full year but who makes that kind of investment if they make that investment in that year, they ought to be able to get the tax credit. The Revenue Committee went right along with them. The provision is out, it's in Frank Korshoj's bill. It is up here for consideration and there isn't a dissenting vote in the Revenue Committee on that issue. What was the underlying theme? We hadn't captured the intention of the body with the language. So the shibboleth don't change 775, don't change 270, got broken. Why did it get broken? Because we hadn't captured sufficiently the intention of the body with the language. We made it too hard to get the tax credit and the business groups came in and said, please, change 270. And the shibboleth was broken. Well now the very same day Jim McFarland brought his bill, 437, in and he said, you know what, the language of the bill didn't capture the intention of the body. And having just the moment before passed out of committee the idea that, in fact, the language hadn't captured the intent and made the tax credits easier to get in 270, the committee said, that's right, that's right. Jim McFarland has landed an effective and consistent argument here. We didn't mean to give people tax credits for reducing jobs, did we? No, there isn't a person in this body who voted for 775, and I'm one of them who voted to give tax credits to businesses who reduced jobs. That wasn't our intention, that wasn't our desire, that was never spoken on the floor nor was it by the administration. And the point and the time has come to say, you're right, we didn't mean to do that and we're going to make the correction just as we're about to make the correction in making the tax credits easier to get...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...in 270. You've got to play fair here. You've got to go back to the original intent and live by it and the intent of 775 was to expand jobs, not to contract. I'm going to vote for 437. I urge the body to do the same.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. On the McFarland amendment to the bill, a number of lights. Senator Elmer, would you care to speak to the amendment or to the bill?

SENATOR ELMER: I think that my questions are germane to the