there was a large hue and cry about how we were destroying the fragile soils in the Sandhills and as a result of animosities, somewhat locally, somewhat at a federal level, there was a move to discourage irrigation in certain areas. And companies which had been very dominant in their fields suddenly found themselves upon hard times because of the action of the federal government. Well I can go on and on and on and I can recite many more. The question I want to raise here, and I think certainly it ought to be discussed, and there is a difference, there is a vast difference in a company which sets out to deliberately reduce its workforce by virtue of automation, new technology, et cetera, and one which has to reduce its workforce for other reasons. On the other hand, are we going to penalize a company from accepting new technology that does result in fewer employees just in order to maintain the tax breaks? It's kind of interesting, each time we, as government people, get our oar in the water while we pull the boat forward, someone else's relative position perhaps becomes a little more weak. I think we have to recognize that and we ought not to forget it. Senator Brad Ashford mentioned the boom in Omaha. I would suggest the boom in Omaha would be more of a 22 pop...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...if it were not for the federal expenditures at Offutt and some of the other areas in the city and, of course, the expenditure of state funds and the state investment in that area and, of course, along with it also the federally subsidized housing boom which is going on in that community. We are going to hear more about that at a later date I am sure, and there will be plenty of people who say it is not federally subsidized, that the S & Ls are paying a fair rate. I beg to differ. But the point I want to make is this, that many times by adverse action of a government we impact upon a business in a way which is detrimental to that business. Are we then going to take one more swipe at that business with this bill and say because of the fact that you have reduced your employees, we will now pull that tax break? Are we then, in effect, making the weak weaker, the strong stronger? Are we reducing competition in an area where competition may become vital and be very, very important. I am deeply concerned as I watch the mergers among companies today that we are marching down a path where competition in the business community is not going to be to the best interest of the consumer and to the extent...