

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Senator Elmer suggested it also has a certain residence with 775.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: That...Senator Elmer, that makes even more sense. I appreciate that. And it's half of 30, and I'm sure if we work on it, Senator Chambers, we can even make it equal to 71, but we're not going to do that at this point. Finally, I would like to get to...those are some questions we'll need to be talking about on the third section, but the amendment that I have before us takes the portion on line 14 and simply says that we'll take the maximum allowable 500,000 and lower it to 250,000. This does not do anything on the funding. Those fights will be com...will be coming later. I am assuming, and maybe I'm incorrect, but I am assuming if the bill isn't outright killed that it is going to be substantially reduced, it should be. And if it is substantially reduced, even Senator Wickersham argued that the 500,000 level would probably be too high because then you could potentially have five or six different companies using up all of the grant money when we really want to try to get it out to as many people as possible throughout the state. So what mine would do, it would be lowering the amount maximum to 250,000 only with the understanding that when you have a lower amount you can have more grants and you can offer more help to different areas of the state throughout the entire state. And the more grants that we have available, the more...the better opportunity for the concept of the bill to work. So if you believe or if you're going to be voting at some point for a lower amount or to kill the bill at some point, you really should vote to lower it to 250 now because if we don't and we wait and see what happens on the A bill, this bill will be on Final Reading and you're not going to be able to make those changes now. So I'm actually, as I told Senator Engel, not trying to cause anything...any damage to the bill but trying to set up for possibilities. If, in fact, it will be reduced at a lower level, the 250,000 ceiling makes more sense for us to do. And if not, I'm sure we could probably come back with some amendment at some point. But I do believe it should be lowered simply because the more grants you can get out, the more people in Nebraska we can help. And we've really been accused a lot, and rightly so and not necessarily negatively so, of trying to help some of those large companies that will bring a bigger tax base to the state that can help us statewide in not only the amount of people we have in the state but the tax bases, those that are paying taxes which will help us all in the property tax dilemma. So I'm not arguing that's a