

little town they had a lace factory which was world renowned. They also had a furniture manufacturer. And it struck me at the time that it would be so wonderful instead of, as we're doing in the United States, it seems as if we're moving more and more into larger and larger businesses where everything is homogenized and everything is the same, and if you go to one McDonald's in one town, it's the same as another McDonald's in another town, and there's little individuality, and there is not much exclusivity anymore. And it occurred to me that it would be nice if we could somehow encourage more of these small businesses in our villages and in our towns and in our cities. And I, personally, think this is a good economic development tool in this package because it does allow the more locally owned businesses. Now, Senator Lindsay, I grant you, I may not realize all the nuances of this issue, and I don't really know what you mean by a large brewpub, and maybe you can explain that. But I think that this is the kind of business that we need to encourage, those that are owned at the local level and those that distribute at the local level. And, for those two reasons, I would encourage you to think seriously about adopting the Landis amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President, members. Let me just make clear for Senator Schellpeper that I also have a committee that has a volume of legislation and it's difficult to get...to get bills lined up on the same subject matter. So I want to make clear I was not suggesting anything that there was an intent to treat my bill unfairly. That's not the case. I just know that when bills come at a different time it is difficult to do that scheduling. But, nonetheless, I do want to point out that there does make a difference, and here's why, my bill introduced on January 3, scheduled for hearing February 15. I mean a notice of hearing was filed February 15 for a hearing on 2-26. The other one, Senator Landis' bill, was set for hearing on 1-25 for a hearing on 2-5. So the hearing...and that came out on 2-21. So the bill, Senator Landis' bill was out on the floor prioritized and moving its way through General File before there was a hearing on the other side of that story. So it's difficult for the committee to hear both sides of that, and that's the extent I'm going to say about the scheduling. The point was simply to make clear that there are two sides, but I'm not sure the committee got an opportunity to hear. And that's