

SPEAKER WITHEM: That's what I heard you say and my recollection was that...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I only have a minute so I'll let you look at it...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yeah. Yeah.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and listen a minute. But here's what would be interesting if what Senator Withem says is correct. You have a law that says I'm not limited by any other provision of law. Then you have another provision that says I'm not limited by any other provision of law. So if they conflict, neither limits the other or both limit each other, or the one passed most recently limits the one that was passed before which says it is not limited by any provision of law, and it doesn't amend any other provision of law. So if it doesn't amend that provision of law, that provision of law stands unamended, unaffected and you have another conflict.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time. Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President, and members, I rise in opposition to the Chambers amendment. And I think Senator Chambers bringing the issue back up is a good idea. I think, looking at it, refining it might be a good idea. An outright repeal, I think, is a bad idea. I think it's a step backwards where we're in the position where the next time we have a large company that wants to locate in Nebraska we are then again ill-prepared to try to encourage them or entice them to come to the state, possibly getting us in the position where we go through the same scenario that we did this year if we have another one that's on the horizon. I think the problem...and Senator Hall made the point during the debate on the Micron bills that companies are looking for a stable tax policy. And I think the downside of the debate we went through was that, that it doesn't appear to be a stable tax policy. I think the companies that are looking at the state do want to see something that's stable. They do want stability. They want something they can rely on in the long term. And, by setting this type for precedent regard...of repealing this two months after, a month after, whatever it's been since it was passed, I think, does contribute to a sense of instability in what the state is willing to do not just in the economic development area but in