

offer that amendment on Select File with the intent that this bill be advanced at that point and bring up the issues that address that particular question. So, Mr. Speaker, I would withdraw this amendment at this time.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. It is withdrawn. Back to the advancement of the bill, Senator Schmit, please, followed by Senator Wesely and Senator Hannibal.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, it seems that more and more this year I find myself in somewhat of a minority position on a number of bills and even more strangely, I find myself in a position where I, in this particular instance, I might even be in opposition to the bill because of some points I want to make here today, notwithstanding the good arguments that have been made in support of the amendment and the bill. I hope that the amendment is properly drawn. I'm not sure that it is, but my principal concerns are these. Number one, businesses do not always follow a steady course and a course in progress. Businesses, as individuals, frequently have reverses. I have a question that I think we ought to raise here today because as I well remember that when the freight train was roaring with engineer Vard Johnson at the helm in 1987, no objections were excepted to any of the arguments which Vard made. And today, again, we're saying well we never intended, we never intended that a business would be rewarded for not creating jobs and I would probably go along with that for the most part. The point I want to make here is this, that suppose, as Senator Ashford made a point of, that because of some event that takes place, a business suffers a reverse, are we going to compound that business's problems then by removing from that business the tax breaks which we had originally given to it? Senator Barrett can tell you of the problems that developed in Lexington when they closed the New Holland plant out there and, of course, now the resurging business climate because of the opening of that plant with IBP. But many businesses that did a lot of business with New Holland suddenly found themselves in serious trouble. We found the same thing in Schuyler, Nebraska, and Senator Schellpeper can tell you, when they closed the packing house there. Many businesses that were companion businesses of that plant suffered severe reverses. And certainly it could not be expected that those businesses then could maintain their workforce. Are we going to doubly penalize that business because of that fact? I'd point out another thing, you all recall a few years ago when we had a lot of surplus crops and