

state that this act would supersede any older act in the event of a conflict. I don't see that language here either. As you look back at legislative history, I believe Senator Kristensen offered an amendment on General File that was, you will recall, divided, and the portion of that issue that was divided and held to be nongermane had the repealer sections in it, as I recall looking at it. And I had understood that there was going to be some discussion maybe to establish legislative intent as a means of addressing this issue. It's doubtful in my mind that legislative intent can be sufficient to comply with the constitutional provisions, if, in the event the constitutional question is here that might be...I was hesitant to do this, because the thought occurred to me that if this isn't an operable act by virtue of not having a repealer, why there was some...it was one really good way to address my concern that might later come up in LB 262, because that could be the vehicle to correct the flaw. And there is some advantage to have that issue out there, if it is out there. But specifically my question to one of the introducers, if they would be willing to bracket the bill to provide an opportunity to write to the Attorney General as to whether or not there is a constitutional issue here making the act inoperable by virtue of not having the repealer clause or any reference that this act supersedes. I know there have, on occasion, been court cases that held that the last act passed is the one that...and certainly this has been true in the course of a session, that the last act passed was the one that superseded. But I'm not sure if this also applies to the existing law that was not changed elsewhere during that session. So, if one of them would answer the question of willingness to hold, pending the seeking of an Attorney General's Opinion, I would appreciate it, because I...it's an important act, it has major change, major impact, and it would seem unfortunate if that major impact was somehow or other not accomplished just simply because of the problem without having a repealer clause. So, if somebody would answer the question, I can either withdraw it or proceed with it, I don't know.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Ashford.

SENATOR ASHFORD: I think I can answer the question, Senator Warner. No, we won't agree to bracket the bill. We checked with the language that you have referred, on the language and the intent that you referred to with the Revisor of Statutes and with several attorneys, and the conclusion is that this bill and