

April 27, 1981

LB 284

unconstitutionality and to permit us to go forward in the next week and to forge the coalition that is necessary to assure all of us and all of our constituencies that this issue has been dealt with....

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: ...that this issue has been dealt with fairly. Now this morning I voted for LB 486 which was a bill that undid some of the work that occurred last year on the railroad taxation matter, and the reason I voted to undo some of the work that was done last year is because when we acted last year we did hurt, we did unduly hurt some rural areas. We did it unwittingly because we just didn't happen to have the benefit of the most accurate figures. I think it is important for us to try to do right in this body, and right, in my opinion, means for us to strike an accord, to strike an accord on a distributional formula that genuinely is fair to all. It can be done. We have to... we have, in a sense, to subsume self to state, and if we do that, we will do right.

PRESIDENT: Before we take up the next speaker, the Chair would like to introduce from Senator Carsten's District four students from Nebraska City, Otoe County District 17, Mrs. Walter Bosley, teacher, and two adults, in the north balcony. Would you welcome them to the Unicameral Legislature. Welcome. The Chair recognizes Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise to oppose the DeCamp amendment. Very simply this is why I think that this is a mistake at this time. You know, if the DeCamp amendment...the DeCamp-Schmit amendment were based on the Schmit formula for the distribution of the money the first year heavily weighted to rural areas and was also distributed that way on the second year and had a sunset clause, I could probably vote for it. Now I would hold my breath and I would do a little self-flatulation in the process but I could probably vote for it because then I see a very honest attempt, a very sincere attempt to solve the problem in a short term. But you see we have a long term solution which is basically, according to the Attorney General, unconstitutional. So really what happens is simply this, we do almost the same thing only the sunset clause is a questionable constitutional proposal. Now I think if we are going to have a sunset clause, we ought to make it constitutional. I think this body ought to at some