

SPEAKER MARVEL: There was a question on whether or not this was a reconsideration. The Chair will need a minute because I wasn't here when this started. So if you will bear with me a minute, I'll be right with you. Record.

CLERK: 21 ayes, 8 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Debate does not cease. Will you all turn your lights off and turn them back on again so that we can get orientated up here. Senator Koch, will you turn your light off. Senator Schmit, Lamb and Hefner, will you please turn your lights off so we can start over again. Senator Cullan, will you turn your light off please. Now indicate to me which of you want to speak to the Newell amendment. Senator Cullan, do you want to speak to the Newell amendment? Do you want to speak to the Newell amendment? Senator Kelly, do you wish to speak to the Newell amendment? Senator Lewis, do you wish to speak to the. . . Senator Labeledz? Senator Pirsch, do you wish to speak to the Newell amendment?

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to support Senator Newell's amendment which replaces LB 882. I believe that 882 is ludicrous and suspect constitutionally to hang distributions of subdivisions on a time in the past and a value back in history. I would like to briefly share with you, tell you about Louie the XIV in the height of his glory was reported to tell his prime minister the trick is to pluck the goose with the least amount of squawking. I believe that is the philosophy of the Legislature in this action today, but also a word of warning. The golden goose is awake now. The squawking is growing deafening. We all know what happened to Louie XIV.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Burrows, do you wish to speak to the Newell amendment.

SENATOR BURROWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would support the Newell amendment because when 882 came before the Revenue Committee several months ago, we had a problem of constitutionality, question with the bill and I would be willing to support any amendments that could clarify the problems that it has and keep the distribution near that distribution that was originally intended in 518 but never had a solution to. Now there is no substantial amendment to it. I imagine the 25 votes are probably here to pass 882 with no changes. But no reason and no arguments as to how they are beating the constitutional question have really been resolved. I would like to have someone explain to me how they are going to defend 882 in the courts. I think the Legislature is acting