

granted the in lieu of tax provision seems to be somewhat unanimous we have to deal with. I have no problem with that, but, you know, I know foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds, but the problem is when you start amending LB 838 and changing it I don't know how you send out anything and the whole thing is opened up. And Senator Withem is right, obviously it is germane, it's possible you ought to do it. You know, I've always taken a stand you ought to try not to do it on these bills because it's going to make it even harder for these bills to advance in the future. But having said all that, I mean the in lieu of tax is one thing, common levy is another. It is certainly something that's been killed in two committees this year. I mean it's like Senator Withem wanted to lighten up LB 348 and weight down LB 839 with it. Now if LB 839 doesn't pass, it's not the end of the world. It's only worth \$34,000. But I think if the in lieu of tax thing is something that absolutely has to be done and there's unanimous agreement in the body, if LB 839 is the only vehicle to do it, I'm not going to stand in the way. But from a pure standpoint, I don't know where you draw the line arbitrarily and for that reason I've drawn it very close to the goal line saying you shouldn't amend these bills. And that's consistent approach I've took and I'll stand by, but certainly when you get into the common levy portion with the amendment, you're dealing with something that is far from unanimous within the body. I guess as far as having to be done this year I think when two different committees...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR MOORE: ...kill an issue that's...and I'm not on either of those committees, I don't understand that, I would think the Legislature to some degree has spoken and obviously a full vote would...may change that. But I think LB 348 is a better vehicle for that. And so with that, I'd rise to oppose the amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes. I'd just like to make a few remarks if I could, please. Number one, Senator Wickersham pointed out drafting problems with the amendment. I've consulted committee counsel on that particular question. She indicates to me the correct language was in fact taken to bill drafters office, that this is a typo and as a typo with that documentation there should be no problem handling that through an E & R amendment. So I would like to...at least that is the intention of the