

It's kind of strange, apparently, maybe Mr. Strange was not in favor of encouraging the establishment of large feedlots in Nebraska. I just want to make another comparison. I asked Senator Vard Johnson, what was the comparative value of a new job created under 270 as one...as to one created under 775? And it appeared to me that it was about, if a new job under 775 was worth a dollar, that a new job under 270 was worth about seven cents. Vard said, no, Loran, you're a little high, it's really worth about a nickel. Now I understand you're trying to correct that this year. I did see a news item some time ago which pointed out that a new job by someone's standards under 775 costs \$14,000 in tax breaks whereas a new job under 270 costs about 1,200. So much for the poor man's bill. The point I want to make is this. I did not support the bill. I hope the bill continues to work as Senator Hannibal so glowingly says it is working. I hope that it does not, that it does not tilt the scales more than necessary toward the large and powerful and affluent and rich corporations as opposed to the small businesses. I oppose the portion of the bill which did not let it apply to the family owned business. I think that was wrong. The point I want to make is this, that I think it is high time that we recognize that every time we pass one of these bills, we have the law of unintended consequences come into play. That's why you're here today. That's why you're arguing the merits of LB 437, because no one would listen to the arguments on 775 and no one is going to listen very much today to my argument on 437 because they say, oh, my gosh, we never expected Mutual to reduce their workforce and be enriched. I'm going to ask you a question. How many of you want your health insurance to continue to rise? Mutual is a provider of health insurance, competitor to Blue Cross and Blue Shield, by the way, but nonetheless, a very good company. Are we going to say that they must keep those employees on board in order to qualify for the tax breaks even if it results in increased costs of health insurance? I think not. Are we going to say that because of the use of computers and technology that replaces a bunch of people we've got to keep them employed regardless just to pick up the tax breaks? I don't know, I didn't draft the bill. I wasn't a proponent. I'm asking the questions of the proponents. Now I'm asking these questions again today because I want to be certain that you do not aggravate a situation which today is already not very good in some instances. I think it is important that we ask ourselves as we move on this bill, is it doing what we want it to do? If it is doing what we wanted it to do, then we should make changes slowly. Sure, I could ask a