

June 5, 1991

LB 829
LR 186

long-term. With that, I filed a motion yesterday, the rest of you have probably seen by now, and that's to extend the session for two more days. That is solely for the purposes of LB 829, that is not for the purpose of constitutional amendment 186, I have nothing in mind with that, that is not the agenda, that is not the purpose for filing that motion to extend. It was done in a limited purpose for a reason. If we do need to deal with 829 and change it, and the change...the amendment I have up here is really Senator Horgan's amendment that he had the other day, and that's to put all the property at 2.3, to treat everything equally, but maintain the integrity of this plan that I think has been worked out, and I think is probably satisfactory to deal with the short-term problems. But I have a tough time, because when I know when we're going to go back home we're going to have a lawsuit filed against us. And you can bank and say, well, maybe the railroads or those centrally assessed properties aren't going to file suit against us, and we'll get by one year. If all we can do is buy ourselves one year of time, we'll be okay. But I don't think that probably makes very good sense to know that we're going to violate federal law when we do it. And, once again, the Legislature, people are going to say to us, you can't get it right, you screwed it up again, we're back in the Supreme Court, and the integrity of the system again is called into question. And my intent was at some time, because I think a legitimate concern should be, well do you have a replacement plan. At this point in time we've discussed every replacement plan in sight. I think with a minor modification we can do that. If we truly want to do something with LB 829, we either don't take it up today, we don't advance it, and spend some time to fix it, and I think the fix is very slight, but I think it's very significant to bring it into compliance with the federal law. If the body wants to go ahead and pass LB 829, so be it. Then I think the need and the necessity for extending the session isn't there. Why would you want to extend the session? Well, one, it's cheaper than calling into special session because that's seven days. The two extended days does not have to be tomorrow and the next day, in fact it might be wise to have a cooling off period. Might be wise to come back a week from Monday and Tuesday, there's nothing sacred about extending it for three days either. We can handle that motion later. The reason I had it printed was at least to alert you to the fact that was an option there. I know there's threats of special session, I think that has to do with 186 and the other attendant amendments or positions on that bill. But a simple extension of the session is inexpensive, compared to a special