

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 26, 1999 LB 271

you with this amendment. And instead of bringing you an amendment that has deletions and insertions in it, what I have brought you in AM1465 is simply restated language for the amendment so you can see for yourself what it do...what it does. This...without trying to interlineate words or subtract words. If you adopt the amendment, this is what it will look like. That's what this section will look like. I thought that was maybe a more useful process for us at the moment than the standard process. But the little packet that I handed out where you have a copy of the amendment, then if you look behind that, you will see two different amendments: AM1454, and then you'll see one that isn't in bill drafter's form. Those two sheets show you what AM1465 does, with one addition. And I'll describe these so that you can see them. But again, the effort...I hope this doesn't confuse you...but the effort is to allow you to see the language in context so you know how that section will read. But behind the front page, you will see the standard bill drafting techniques, so you can see what goes out and what comes in. But this area is rather technical in its phrasing, and it seemed to me to be useful to make this presentation to you. If you don't agree, let me know, and I'll bring this bit by bit so you can see what we're doing. But there are three things in this amendment. One of them is an operative date. It states that the act becomes effective January 1 of the year 2000. Now, when the bill was originally drafted, we didn't think that was necessary, because we could not, obviously, go back to January 1 of this year and cause property to be taxed, because this bill, even if it passes, won't be effective until September. So at that point, you can't go back in the assessment process and say property is subject to taxation. We've never done that. I don't know of any means that we could use to do that, in fact. So from my standpoint, I think the language that you see up here, "This act becomes operative on January 1, 2000", is kind of comfort language. But that's okay. It does give a bright line, and people won't have any doubts about when the bill becomes effective. And if it's just comfort language, that's fine. It doesn't hurt anything as comfort language. But I think, quite candidly, it's what would have happened anyway. Alright. The second piece of this amendment is the issue that was raised by Senator Beutler. And if you recall, Senator Beutler withdrew an amendment that was a little bit more complicated in its phrasing, and Senator Beutler said, I want to