

items in LB 1 that were...excuse me. There are some items not in LB 1 that were in LB 1063. I would mention those briefly as a group. One of those is the severability clause that was contained in the original enactment. It had an "inseverability" clause, or "nonseverability", or reverse severability, depending on one's choice of words. But, nevertheless, that section of 1063 would not be included. Secondly, a number of provisions that were subsequently included in LB 719A do not need to be reenacted and are excluded. And then finally there were some sections that could be defined as obsolete now with the passage of CA1 that were included in LB 1063, which is not needed, primarily among those would be the dual reporting that was provided for in 1063, and in particular the necessity of that language if the constitutional amendment would have failed. I might mention briefly when you look at the bill, the new and stricken matter, or the language of the bill which does not indicate new or stricken actually is an amendment of 1063, and the stricken language would be language that was in 1063, which, while there is a question of or a cloud on its constitutionality, it has not been declared as such, and so it's appropriate under the rules of the Legislature that they be indicated as stricken matter. Finally, I want to comment on what Senator Baack has already indicated, and I want to yield part of the closing to Senator Hall, who, I suspect will indicate somewhat the same thing. But it would certainly be my hope that there would be no amendments, preferably no amendments to LB 1, and that LB 3 would be utilized for amendments. There's a couple of very solid constitutional reasons to do that. One is that there can always be the issue of whether some amendment was within the call, which could result in a court case that would be unnecessary, at least undesirable. And then, secondly, there could be an amendment offered to...or adopted to LB 1 which would not be permitted even under the provisions of the constitutional amendment that was adopted in the primary. And that becomes a very major concern if that would occur, because if any section of LB 1 was declared unconstitutional you would fall back to LB 1063, and 1063 may be constitutionally suspect, because it hadn't been adopted prior to the adoption of the constitutional amendment by the voters. And then you fall back to what would then be existing law. That would be the result of the court decision last year, or earlier this year I should say, which placed all of the big three or big four items back on the property tax rolls at actual value. And the potential of problems, it seems to me, is too great. With that explanation, I yield the balance of the time to Senator Hall.