

place a couple of days ago, was to put it in at \$6,800 or 7 percent. This compromising group came together, came together with a different set of numbers but conceptually the same thing as the amendment, and by virtue of the strong support for that and the rational judgment that went into it, I will withdraw my amendment and be supporting the negotiated figures of the \$5,400 and 8.5 percent, which numbers are numbers, and if that is what we can get the majority to agree to, I think that is the way to go. So I would respectfully like to withdraw my amendment, please.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. It is withdrawn. Senator Withem is announcing the presence of 90 fourth graders from Carriage Hill in Papillion, with their teachers, in our north balcony. Would you folks please stand and be recognized by the Legislature. Thank you, we appreciate your being here. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next motion I have is by Senators Conway and Haberman to return the bill for specific amendment. Senator, this is the severability clause.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Conway.

SENATOR CONWAY: Mr. Speaker and members, I think here is one amendment that is worthy of consideration and discussion at this particular point in time. What this amendment requests is that the severability clause is included in the proposal as it is advanced. We now, under the compromise, have broken down several sections of the bill dealing with in the neighborhood of, what is it, 95 plus or minus a few dollars in terms of total tax relief. I think it would be maybe somewhat of a misgiving on our part on our part and fall below our ultimate responsibility in terms of property tax relief not to attach the severability clause, since there has been so many Attorney General's Opinions. There still is always that lurking threat that some aspect, and if you will read the way the bill is written now, it basically has a reverse severability clause that if anything is deemed to be unconstitutional, the whole bill is going to be unconstitutional. I think we have too many critical areas in here. We have a lot of situations that I think it is important to put in the severability clause. It could very well be that some aspect of the personal property section, for instance, were to be deemed unconstitutional, or the centrally assessed property, which always seems to be subject to court