

phenomenal in helping the economy and helping rural Nebraska's economy go. So 250,000, depends where you're at in the state, can be a lot of money. What I'm trying to do is say if we're going to have a reduced amount, let's try to have as many of the grants as possible to help the people in the State of Nebraska throughout the state by reducing it to \$250,000 and keeping in mind that the total amount will be less than the \$6 million. We at least want to have more people be able to benefit from this type of legislation than just large companies that might get another \$500,000 and still qualify for LB 270 and maybe, even on the outside chance, qualify for LB 775 because no one has convinced me yet that you could not still make the investment and all the things for 775 and still not get \$500,000 from this fund. And if we're really trying to help small businesses for once in all of Nebraska, it makes sense that we have an amount that will allow as many as possible to receive it and \$250,000 is still a lot of money to help on development and I would urge its adoption.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. You've heard the closing. The question is the adoption of the Bernard-Stevens amendment. By the way, the house is still under call. We never did raise the call. The question before the body is the adoption of the Bernard-Stevens amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, and a record vote has been requested. The call is raised.

CLERK: (Read record vote. See page 2112 of the Legislative Journal.) 12 ayes, 20 nays, Mr. President, on the amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: The amendment is not agreed to. Mr. Clerk, anything else on this particular division of the Wickersham amendment?

CLERK: Senator Maurstad would move to amend this division.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment has been published on Journal page 2036. For those of you that are looking at the Wickersham-Engel amendment, it would be item 2(d). It merely deletes the cost benefit analysis that was included in the proposed amendment. I have basically three reasons why I'd like for the body to consider. First of all, we had quite a bit of discussion relative to cost benefit analysis