

as it is, to understand we have much greater challenges ahead and the future holds the need for additional changes in economic development policy.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Additional discussion on the Hall amendment. Senator Haberman, followed by Senators Landis, Korshoj, Schellpeper, Chizek and Dierks. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President and members of the body, this discussion about the possible lost revenue is very interesting as if I remember correctly, this body voted to give the telephone company the \$40 million tax relief bill here just a few weeks ago. And I believe that some of the senators who have been up here talking for this amendment supported that \$40 million tax gift, so to speak. Pardon? Oh, I'm sorry, it was only 14 million. That doesn't change the color of it at all. It's only 14...it's only a \$27 million mistake. However, if you look at the sheet, there was no opposition to this bill, none whatsoever. Now if it was so bad, surely we would have had somebody in there opposing it. In fact, it was supported by the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, Senator Landis, and we have raised and given money to ADC, oh, I would say a half a dozen times in my 11 years down here. So I think that they have fared very well from this body. You know, it's more than just a pat on the back, it means a lot to the small communities. It isn't going to hurt anybody. I can't see why all the fuss is over this bill. I think Senator Hall's amendment, although his heart might be in the right place, his mind is in the wrong place and I think that we should vote to defeat Senator Hall's amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Question.

SPEAKER BARRETT: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. Shall debate now cease? Those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Please record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 1 nay to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Debate ceases. Senator Hall, to close.

SENATOR HALL: Mr. President and members, I appreciate the debate on the issue because this is a substantive change, I