

producing, so with that...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...I would listen to, be happy to listen to some comment on those concerns.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Warner, please, followed by Senator Hall and Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, and members of the Legislature, I don't know where it is appropriate for my comments in the discussion but I guess here is as good as any place. I suspect there is not a soul in the body who does not recognize that the amendment is outside the call; even Senator Landis has...I have read and brought with me, as of two weeks ago, papers, news articles, which he has repeatedly indicated that, and so I don't know if there is a strategy being promoted to somehow or other expand the call with this or not, I don't know. But actually it is immaterial to me and for this reason, and that is that as yesterday it was pointed out by Senator Landis' there is this battery of attorneys who are looking for loopholes, and I can't think of a bigger one or a more obvious one than to attach something to LB 7, which it can subsequently be attacked on a basis other than the merit of the legislation itself, and I think there is too much at stake. I am convinced that, as was I thought the majority of the body based upon at least those who signed the brief that was filed on behalf of the Revenue Committee and a number of us in the Legislature, and that was that we wanted to get more clarification from the court on the basis of a rehearing, which was not approved. LB 7, as it was introduced and, essentially, as it stands amended at the moment, addresses the very narrow scope of whether or not the Supreme Court's decision is based upon having one class of property partially...a portion of it exempt and a portion of it taxed, and that runs afoul of both the 14th Amendment as well as the uniformity clause. It seems to me to be a reasonable step to have that clarification. I would hope that the bill is not otherwise encumbered with other attacks on its constitutionality by virtue of what the body does. I think it can be a very clean issue that goes to the court to address the issue specifically of the pending litigation, that is, the 243 cases. I think that with this change it does change...it does provide the opportunity for the court to readdress that issue. It does provide the opportunity for clarification. Those of us who have