

dealing with here. You have had a handout that some of which I believe applies to LB 7. The portion of that handout that says...that had relevance to the 243 or 244 cases, LB 7 does affect those. They are before the Supreme Court. Someone called my attention to that apparently, and I said I can get tripped up easily on the procedure of the Supreme Court, it's been called to my attention that criminal cases take precedent over civil cases which may well be true. But it's also true, as I understand it, that revenue cases take precedent over other civil cases, and if that's in error, I stand to be corrected because I am not attempting to say something that is inaccurate. There is no doubt in my mind, there is no doubt in my mind that LB 7, as it is proposed, and I fought to keep it clean, as proposed may well address the issue of the Enron case. Admittedly, it does not change the reliance on property tax that many of you have discussed, neither real nor personal property. However, it could have a very direct impact. It could have a very direct impact because without this language and you had...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...substantial further reduction in revenue for local government, which subsequently you are also going to be making up with sales and/or income tax or some other source of revenue, then you're talking at least potentially of another 120 million you have to raise before you ever get any real property tax relief for the homeowner and the landowner that we have otherwise talked about on numerous occasions. I would urge...and I appreciate those of you who at least are considering a vote for reconsideration, and I would appreciate it if you would also vote for the emergency clause because, without it, there is no other way, as I understand it, to address those 243 pending cases. I accept what the Attorney General has written. I think it's fairly factual. I have never heard it...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR WARNER: ...disputed.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. You have heard the closing and the question is the Warner motion to reconsider LB 7E. The bill is on Final Reading. Contrary to our normal situation, it requires 33 votes to reconsider the bill because it is on Final Reading. Those in favor of the motion to reconsider, please