

implementation of Amendment 1. We debate either the concepts that are in Senator Landis's LB 320 or Senator Kristensen's bill or my bill dealing with a percentage of market. And that's where the debate should center on this issue. This bill is a housekeeping bill, if you will. It does allow for another year. A question was raised in committee as to whether or not this bill will run us into problems in terms of a constitutional question or whether or not someone could argue that the Legislature did not act. There are Attorney General's Opinions that say that, based on 305 that we did back in 1985, that that's not a problem and as long as the Legislature is continuing to work on that issue, address it, that there won't be a problem. It is my hope that, through the passage of this bill, the Legislature's Revenue Committee and then the Legislature as a body will address, on a long term basis, the ag land valuation issue. I would hope that we would pass some legislation if it is in proper form yet this year. We have the balance of this 90-day session to do that. I would hope we would be able to get that done. If we were not, we would have next year to do that. We would be under a little bit of a time crunch in order to get that done, but we would be able to get that done. I would hope and prefer that we were able to do it this year, but that doesn't mean we're going to rush to do anything if it is not in proper order. But I want to guarantee to the members who have shown a real interest in this issue that it is not my intention to delay or hold back dealing with this issue on a long-term basis, on a permanent basis if that is possible, this year. So, I will make my fight, make my issue when we deal with whatever the Revenue Committee advances to the floor in the terms of the long-term solution, if you will. With that, Madam President, the issue before us is the committee amendments and I appreciate your indulgence to let me wander a little bit on the bill, but all the committee amendments do is they freeze the adjustments after the...on the 1990 level. They clarify the issue of that it is for a one-year time frame and they also allow for the discrepancy to be used at the local level with regard to the uniformity of the valuation. There currently is a practice that there has to be some adjustments made oftentimes at the local level. The way the bill was originally drafted, that would not have been allowed as has been the practice in the past. The amendments just guarantee and ensure that that practice will be able to be continued and it clarifies the specific one-year time frame. With that, Madam President, I would move adoption of the committee amendments.