

understood this bill to be oriented, that is to be oriented with respect to competition coming from other states, and if that were the purpose of the bill, then it had some chance of getting my support. But if the purpose of the bill is going to be changed by Senator Chambers to be transformed from a reactive mechanism to competition from the other states, to becoming simply another method for government interference and government supplements to projects that may or may not be subject to interstate competition, then I will have a harder time dealing with this bill because I, basically, am very conservative with respect to how economic development should happen, if productivity is going to be maximized and I think an awful lot of what we do will happen anyway, probably almost all of it will happen anyway and that the government does not have enough expertise to decide in most cases what is more likely to become productive than do bankers and others who do it on a day-to-day basis. And, therefore, I guess I'm against the Chambers amendment and I have amendment coming up later dealing a little further with criteria in the bill and suggesting that with respect to criteria, since the purpose is to deal with interstate competition, that we ought to have some finding that the businesses assisted, in fact, are involved or there is some realistic threat that they may be going to another state, that we ought to ascertain that before we give out money. And having that philosophy about the general thrust of these kinds of bills, I could not be supportive of Senator Chambers' amendment which basically opens it wide up to assistance. If you look at 81-1201.09, opens it wide up as far as those criteria are concerned to assistance to almost anybody, the limiting factors then being only the factors further outlined in LB 425. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to briefly comment on the first part of Senator Beutler's dialogue. I missed the last part and I apologize for that, but I don't think there's any question that these types of efforts are almost totally focused on the competitive pressures of other states. The use of this type of a tool especially, once again the intent is that Department of Economic Development and the Governor have the ability to put the frosting on the cake and not the peanut butter on the bread for these types of projects. So I would not see if you had a competitive situation involving two communities in Nebraska that this would, that this