

anybody who is just a regular homeowner in my district, for example, and I understand that. Howard, that is fine. But in this point in time, because of the way the bill has come about, the changes made, the cap that has been taken off, I think it makes sense to strike the reverse severability, the nonseverability clause and adopt Senator Conway's amendment because what you are saying there is that in a worse case scenario, one that very likely and probably never will take place, that at least everyone who owns a home and those include all those folks that fall in the category, except, of course, Senator Chambers's renters, will at least receive that \$5,400 that is allowed for under the bill. I think it makes good sense we guarantee at least that much and I think it is a good amendment to LB 84. I would urge the body to return the bill to Select File for adoption of Senator Conway's amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Moore, followed by Senators Schmit, Haberman, and Chambers. Senator Mocre.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. Speaker and members, I rise to strongly oppose and strongly object to Senator Conway's amendment and I'm a little bit, well, not surprised, but I was concerned to hear Senator Hall's comments because when he described the worst case scenario, I agree with him, it is exactly that. It is the worst case scenario from my point of view because then what would happen, if, indeed, something would be found unconstitutional, lo and behold, we go right back to just the homestead exemption, to LB 747 as Senator Chizek originally introduced. That is obviously not what I want, not what Senator Lamb wants, and not what was agreed to. And Senator Conway in his opening talked about, well, you know, in case the centrally assessed property, that \$4 million part of the price tag, was found constitutionally suspect, it would be unfair to hold the other \$94 million up. Well, under that scenario I guess I understand your argument, but I guess I am more concerned about something happening exactly like Senator Hall talked about. Because what would happen, you would throw away the delicately balanced rural-urban compromise that we have tried to work here, what would happen is just the homestead exemption is what would be distributed, and that's, I think, I mean it would be good obviously for the homeowners but it would really be detrimental to what we have tried to work together on here as something we that we can all agree on, and I think if, indeed, something is found constitutionally wrong with LB 84, which I don't think is going to happen, I think since we all agreed on trying to treat