

voted for it, I think it was something we could have gone home and defended, and I can assure you the courts would have smiled upon it. I do not know either what will be the result here, but I would predict, I do not know if this bill carries a severability clause or not, but it had better carry it, because I doubt very much if the disparity in taxation rates will be allowed to stand. Point number two, Senator Will says it's for one year. I pointed out yesterday that in my opinion the Lindsay case will not go directly to the Supreme Court. The Attorney General is not going to stipulate to a set of facts and bypass the district court, it's not going to go directly to the Supreme Court. And, if it does go to the Supreme Court, or when it goes to the Supreme Court, it will be a long time before we get a report back from them. In the meantime, the United States Supreme Court will be hearing the Macy (phonetic) case from California, and it will be that case on which we will decide, here in Nebraska, what shall be the tax policy of this state. If LB 829 becomes law, and if it withstands the test of time, and of the courts, and of the U.S... perhaps Judge Urbom, then I can guarantee you it will not be a one-year solution, it will be a two-year solution, because we will be back here, a year from now, attempting to comply with the mandates of the United States Supreme Court. I have opposed LB 829 for a variety of reasons, and I continue to oppose it. But I do not know either if you can fix it that fast, Senator Kristensen. Mr. Hall of the Revenue Committee would know more than I do as to whether or not we have the severability clause on it, and whether or not we lose the entire bill, or only that portion of the tax which was considered to be unfair and excessive. Might well be, Senator Hall, we're going to save 90 million bucks anyway, and the locals are going to have to pick up the slack somewhere, which we talked about on this floor several times, would not necessarily be all bad. So I think that Senator Kristensen was right to raise the issue. Mr. Hall may be correct in his assessment of it. I do not support the amendment, but I do believe that eventually we are moving more closely toward the kind of solution that was proposed by Senator Carson Rogers and myself, albeit very, very unsavory politically. I would support the motion to return, but I do not expect it to be successful, and I would expect that the bill would pass, but I expect that the bill will have a rough time from that time forward. And I, too, share with those of you who say I do not like to suffer the embarrassment of having to go back to my constituents and say...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.