

might call reverse severability clause. And so for those reasons, I would ask that Senator Conway's motion be defeated.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I rise in support of Senator Conway's amendment. I supported the Lamb amendment that was on Select File that had injected the reverse severability clause into the bill and I did that because there was question at that time with regard to the issue of constitutionality, and I guess you can always make an argument that something is constitutional or unconstitutional based on whatever your opinion might be of the issue, and that is always a good argument that raises folk's eyebrows and gets us to question whether or not we should be doing this. The fact of the matter is here is that, as Senator Lamb has said, we, the collective we, feel that there is a constitutional bill that we are dealing with, but I think that at this point in time it makes sense to strike that reverse severability clause because what it does is, is that if for some reason, and I can't imagine it ever happening, and I don't think the possibility is even remote, that it will happen that someone would file a suit against the distribution of the funds that are laid out in LB 84 with regard to property tax relief. The fact of the matter is is that everyone that is affected or virtually everyone that is affected would be affected by the homestead exemption side of it. In other words, most folks who own agricultural land have a home. Most folks who have business property own a home. Most folks who have industrial or commercial property own a home, virtually all of them. There are very few of them that would fall under the category that Senator Chambers defends and calls those are the renters, the neglected few that fall under that category who would probably not fall under the other side of the category of owning agricultural land or industrial or commercial property. So what you do by adopting the Conway amendment is you make sure that at least everybody gets the homestead exemption side of the bill. And I don't think there is any question with regard to the constitutional problem. If you want to make that argument, that is fine and I think it can be made, but the fact of the matter is I don't think it will be made, and to adopt Senator Conway's amendment in no way impairs LB 84. It is not a millstone around the neck of the bill. Senator Lamb may not like it, and I understand that. He wants to tie as many of his urban colleagues to it as closely as possible, and if it doesn't come to the ag land in his area, then it shouldn't go to