

challenges and the like, the \$4 million in that, are all little small pieces of this bill. The key factor is in the residential properties, the agriculture property and the commercial property, and I think that to maintain that much of the bill by having a severability clause would be very, very important to maintain that much confidence on the part of the taxpayers that we did not put together a bill that by virtue of one line, one item, one phrase, one aspect, would be there. I know Senator Lamb's position, for the most part, basically, appears to be that we...either we have a compromise, all these people have come together, and if we all don't get the pieces that we wanted, by virtue of any process through the court, that then no one should, and that certainly is his prerogative and I respect that, but I think that we have a situation here where this thing is very delicately balanced. It has been a combination of multiple bills that have been brought together. There has been individuals challenging and asking for Attorney General's Opinions on several fronts. We have opinions as such that this looks okay and that looks okay and I am comfortable that it will be, but just out of a safety net for this legislation, I think the severability clause ought to be attached to this particular legislation. So with that, I will wait for additional comments.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, sir. Discussion on the amendment offered by Senator Conway? Senator Lamb, followed by Senators Lamb, excuse me, Hall, Moore and Schmit. Senator Lamb, please.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by Senator Conway, and for the very same reasons that he suggested. This is a bill which we think is fair to all segments of taxpayers, and as such, it has been carefully crafted, and if there should...we do not think anything is unconstitutional. We think we have solved all those constitutional problems here. We think we have, but you cannot always tell how the courts will operate or how lawyers think. But, so for that reason, for that reason we have put in the nonseverability clause, I guess you would call it, so that if any part of it is unconstitutional, then the whole thing goes down because it would not be fair, for instance, to have all the farmers get the benefits of the bill and the homeowners get nothing, or vice versa. So that is the reason it is in there. It has been in there for some time because we recognize the problems that might come about and we had a very conscious decision here. We made a very conscious decision that this should be part of the situation, that we should have what you