

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

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. Thank you, Senator Warner. I rise in support of LB 1 as one of the, I guess, most outspoken and probably most ineffective opponents of LB 1063. Because of the court decision, as mentioned by Senator Warner, and I would again start out by saying I echo his comments, but just urge the body to, A, first adopt LB 1 and pass it on to Select File, and do that in a fashion that would keep it in the form as it was introduced. I make that request knowing full well that there are amendments that are currently filed to the bill and that I am not naive enough to think that that will actually happen. But you need to understand going in; and I asked Senator Warner for a bit of his time as one of the cosponsors of the bill, to explain a little bit why that needs to take place and why, I guess, amendments that I might otherwise support, maybe if they were offered to LB 3, will have to oppose on LB 1. And that is the fact that I don't think we're given any alternative. That the uncertainty of the...because of the recent decisions of the court that to enact LB 1063, probably in any form other than that which it was introduced, would potentially, potentially jeopardize the constitutionality of that piece of legislation again. And I think that the one thing that we all strive, want, and would love to have for at least somewhere between six to eight months would be a little bit of stability in the personal property tax area. We don't have that to date with the most recent Jaksha decision, but that's another issue. And I think that with the passage of LB 1 we come closer to that. It has to remain in the form that it was introduced. I don't like to say that, I don't like to hear that as someone who has offered as many amendments as the next fella to these types of pieces of legislation. I believe that we don't have an alternative. That, if we take this bill and change the format in which it was brought in, we very much run the risk of having another lawsuit that could be challenged, that could be basically upheld by the court, and we could be back only farther down the road, in terms of time, with a tax system that we're not sure where we're at. So, one of the reasons for putting out LB 3 was basically to allow for a vehicle, a trailer bill, if you will, a technical corrections bill, if you'd like, to address changes, substantive and technical, that the body would like to see in the legislation that we passed in LB 1063. There have been problems with the way it is worked. There have been problems practical in their