

know I mean that. But if we invoke cloture, that is fine. I understand how the rules work. It is not a problem here. I have not once said that somehow this is being ramrodded through, not an issue with me. The issue with me is that if we are going to do this stuff, let's do it up front. Let's just say, hey, look, here are the proposals that we want to make available to companies if they are going to come into the state. Let's not bastardize the system with the intent language that is in Section 2, beginning with section (10), which says the State of Nebraska has done a poor job, a terrible job with regard to economic development, because that is exactly what it says. Let's not create some mysterious new definition of what a blighted or substandard area is. We all know it is not true. We are going to argue that somehow within the state, in the judicial system, the court is going to wink at those types of definitions and say it's okay, we buy that. The legislative intent was there. It won't happen. Let's look at these types of proposals. Let's strip all of Section 2. I have got that amendment up. We can finish this real easy if we just do away with the other seven interceding amendments and go to number 9, and say, okay, let's strike Section 2 and come back on Select File and work on some language. That's the second time I've made the offer. I am more than willing to do that. But the intent language, as it exists in this bill, is clearly something that each and every one of us, as Senator Wickersham said, ought to be offended by, and that is not a reflection on the sponsor, by any stretch of the imagination. It is language that is clearly in there because people, for some reason or another, believe that it is necessary to justify the end.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: It is the means to the end. Well, if you have to go through Section 2 as your means, then the end is not justifiable, in my belief. That's all there is to it. It is that simple. If you have to, basically, deny your heritage, so to speak, for purposes of somehow down the line being betrothed to another, to that phantom suitor out there, somehow this bill is going to get us there. Not with this intent language, it is not, and we can wade through all the amendments, for all I care, until 8:47 or however long it takes. With that, examine section... subsection (10) of Section 2, read it, think about it. Is it something that you would support if it was in any other type of legislation? You would not. This bill would be opposed in its entirety, this section, by the Chambers of Commerce in