

November 9, 1992 LB 1

language we could make the amendment prospective. Would you agree with that, Senator Hall?

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Yes, sir.

SENATOR ELMER: My previous statement was I realize that LB 1 is retrospective in nature in that it takes up things that the court has found ill about our transactions here and that the amendment, as written, makes it retrospective as well, thus the \$5 million hit. With the change in language to make it purely prospective and effective for '93, that hit would no longer remain. Is that correct?

SENATOR HALL: Well, the problem would still remain, Senator Elmer, that \$5.1 million has been paid out to local subdivisions...

SENATOR ELMER: Sure.

SENATOR HALL: ...and the argument is that that was represented through this livestock, breeding stock depreciation aspect.

SENATOR ELMER: I understand. With these thoughts then that if we come back at a later time with a prospective amendment that would not affect the retrospective nature of LB 1, then we could probably do that without the fiscal impact. And I really appreciate all of the discussion that's been made in pointing out the inequities of this particular section of LB 829...or LB 1063 as it was passed on depreciation and this adjustment that does need to be made but with the understanding that we do need to do something along this line and we need to change some language that I will prepare before Select File. I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment at this time.

PRESIDENT MOUL: The amendment is withdrawn. We are now back to discussion on the motion to advance the bill. Is there anyone who wishes to discuss this motion? Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, Madam President and members, I'm really not in a good mood to discuss this today because of lack of my usual good health, but I can't let the bill be advanced without at least raising a couple of points. I'm not a technician like most of the men in here are, and women. I'm not good at the