SPEAKER BARRETT: To the bill as amended. Senator Hefner, are you handling it, please.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise to support LB 1 as amended. What we do here is redefine real property. By passing this bill, we say that we can reduce the potential loss at least $30 million to those local government entities, like school districts, counties, villages and cities, and the like. So I really think that we need this. I think that this bill now reads the objective test of the Attorney General's Opinions. I also feel that we need to do this this session. If we would have waited until the regular session, that $30 million would have been gone for good. And so what this does is addresses that problem.

PRESIDENT NICHOL PRESIDING

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Withem, please, followed by Senator Landis.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. President and members of the body, I have a question I would like to direct toward one of the attorneys in here, maybe Senator Kristensen or Senator Ashford or maybe both of them, getting some free legal advice here and I know how much free advice is worth probably. But, Senator Kristensen, I notice in here on page 6, LB 1, Section 4, we're saying the changes made in this bill are expressly intended to apply to all litigation pending as of the date such bill is passed and approved according to law. I see that language also is included in the others. Is this a fairly common legal sort of action to pass legislation and then specifically apply it to litigation that is currently pending? Suit has been filed and action has been taken under a current statute and then the Legislature comes into place and changes that statute midway through. And I am genuinely asking this for information purposes. Is it fair, proper game? Does this go on, from your experience?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Well, I think what you're asking me is a practical question. Does it happen very often? From my experience, no, it doesn't happen very often.

SENATOR WITHEM: Then...but, okay, is it...