

clause and hopefully maintain all of it. I hope 100 percent of it is maintained. But if any one provision, such as I say the centrally assessed or something of that nature would run into any form of difficulty, I would hate to see all the taxpayers in Nebraska view us in any kind of negative fashion and that we made a promise that we weren't able to deliver because of the mechanics of the bill. I don't think there is any value in having reverse severability, and so I offer this as a very good faith amendment for the purpose of making sure that we are doing everything in our power to make sure that this thing will provide the tax relief to as many citizens as we have committed to, publicly and privately and as we process this on the floor. So, with that, I offer the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Moore, please, followed by Senator Hall. And then Senator Lamb, and then Senator Chambers.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, Mr. President and members. As earlier this afternoon, I rise to ardently object to Senator Conway's amendment. Though I understand where he's coming from, I really can't say anything more than I said about two o'clock on this matter. The fact of the matter is that the bill we've been working on, LB 84 in its present form, as a result of very tedious balance of rural/urban concerns, concerns that have plagued this whole issue for years, at least it appears, at least temporarily, we may address the property tax issue in some aspect for one year. And, like I said, I understand Senator Conway's concern about what if the \$4 million, in the centrally assessed category, became constitutionally suspect, you would not want to hold up the other \$94 million. In that case I guess I understand the point he's trying to make, but obviously on the other hand my concern is, as Senator Hall so eloquently stated last time we talked about this, his attitude was, well, if nothing else, you do this and you guarantee that at least the homestead exemption is what will be at least paid out. I guess, as I think Senator Lamb and myself and others, I mean, I obviously have a vast number of homeowners in my district and I want to help them. On the other hand, one of the major priorities for me is that I'm...it's my desire to do something for the ag land, particularly in result of LB 361 that we passed a couple of weeks ago, I think it's important that ag land is addressed. And I think we all agree we don't...this whole issue should be moot. The fact of the matter is that if something would happen I would prefer to remain LB 84 in its present form. And if something happened it would all be held together and no