

difference of opinion as the second half. And it simply says the...if I can find it, that preference shall be given to bidders and applicants for contracts based in Nebraska, if the cost and benefits are equal or superior to those available from competing persons. It obviously says exactly what it means, hopefully, that you can understand this well. It needs very little other discussion, except I'll try to answer questions. It's the issue...I think it's something we've already discussed previously. And with that, except for answering questions, have nothing else to recommend, except to ask for your support for the first half of my amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Lynch. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this half. This is a good proposal. It's what the amendment should have been in total, but it is the portion that makes good sense. It says that we have folks in Nebraska, if they're at, in other words, equal to or greater than, sure, we should give them the nod. We shouldn't foreclose competition, like we just did in the previous amendment, because that's, in essence, what you're going to do. I would urge adoption of this portion of Senator Lynch's amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, just briefly, I'm going to vote no. I appreciate the sentiment of in state bidders, but this issue comes up from time to time in a whole host of areas. Once you start preferential bids requiring state residency, inevitably you get retaliatory legislation from other states, just like we know on insurance premiums, same thing happens there. I don't think that restricting or giving preference for in state bidders, politically obviously is attractive, but it's not good business sense for any state to go down that road. I'm going to vote no.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam President and members, I still think you're missing the point of the entire controversy, that is that rather than to enhance, protect, or impede anyone from achieving a contract with the state, the state should be attempting to guarantee the integrity of the system. And however you do that, whether it's with an out of state bidder, or an in state bidder,