

that the business, if it does survive and comes back and rehires a group of people, might then be available to apply for the tax benefit they lost during that year that they were down, or the two years they were down, if at the end of the tax period the average number of jobs created is sufficient for the entire year, for the entire period. That's not saying it very well, but I think you understand what I'm trying to talk about. Take a look at agriculture. A few years ago we were flying with the geese and then we were knocked down during the early eighties and the middle eighties. Now agriculture has taken off again like a homesick angel and there are those who predict it will never ever stop. I happen to believe otherwise. I happen to believe that every time a cycle goes up it eventually comes back down. I think also, and I will offer an amendment to this bill on Select File that will provide that the benefits be available to agriculture. I don't know, since Vard Johnson is not here, I do not know who the principal proponent of the bill is. Maybe Senator Landis could answer the question for us. Can you tell me, Senator Landis, because I do not have the transcript here when I asked Vard the same question, what was the principal reason for excluding agriculture from the benefits of 775? Do you remember?

SENATOR LANDIS: I do not.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Is there any reason why, if an agriculturally oriented business were to qualify otherwise, it should not be able to qualify for the tax benefits of 775?

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Korshoj has an active memory and is prepared to respond.

SENATOR KORSHOJ: Yes, I can answer that, Mr. Speaker and members. I went down the aisle and asked Vard Johnson why did you take agriculture out of it? And it was a very simple answer. He says, Marty Strange didn't want it in there. That was the answer he gave me. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well actually, some day Marty ought to make man of the year on the front page of the World-Herald Magazine of the Midlands because he probably has had more influence on agriculture, either adversely or otherwise, than most of us who have been in agriculture for a long time. And I don't say that in a negative manner. I think he has had and has had some positive effect, factly, but the point I want to make is this.