

January 22, 1976

CLERK: LB 434. I move to bracket..he asks unanimous consent to bracket LB 434 until February 5th. Signed Senator Schmit.

PRESIDENT: Are there objections? Seeing none, it is so ordered. LB 464.

CLERK: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to bracket LB 464 until 1/29, Mr. President. Signed Senator DeCamp. 405 was a motion to withdraw. That is just laid over and then 464 bracket until 1/29. Mr. President, I move to bracket LB 433 until March 31. Okay, now, Mr. President, the next bill that can properly come up is LB 651. Mr. President, LB 651 introduced by Senator Carsten. Read title. There are Committee amendments by Senator Carsten's Revenue Committee.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Were they printed in the Journal, Vince?

CLERK: Yes, they are. They are relatively short, however. Read amendment. See page 280, Journal.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, the Committee amendments are really short and simple. The original bill providing for the overlevy was set in the bill from 3 to 7, and in the Committee, the Committee voted to strike that 5 or 3 in the new matter and reinsert the old so that the Committee amendment, then, to the bill would say not less than 5 nor more than 7 and that is the Committee amendment and I move for its adoption, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion? You have heard the motion. Record your vote. Record.

CLERK: 29 ayes, 1 nay.

PRESIDENT: Motion carries. Senator Carsten.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Mr. President, I move for the advancement of LB 651 as amended. LB 651 does, in the same respect, what LB 4, I believe it was, that we had in the special session whereby we had set a minimum and a maximum for the Board of Equalization to use in determining the tax rates for the year. As you recall, at that time, it was only done for one year, which was not less than 2 nor more than 3. Now in the hearing that we had during that special session, there was a recommendation that perhaps this should be included in the permanent statutes and so that is what we have attempted to do here and the introduction of the bill, I had originally said 3 to 7 which was quite a flexible area for the Board of Equalization to use. However, there was a suggestion in our Committee Hearing that it be changed and I had no real definite commitment for the 3 to 7. It was only a figure to start with and the Committee on a, as you can see by your Committee report, six to one vote did approve of that amendment. So it would now read not less than 5 nor more than 7. This bill does give the Board of Equalization some help in determining what they might consider a problem in