

February 25, 1992 LB 1120

CLERK: 25 ayes, 12 nays to cease debate.

SPEAKER BAACK: Debate has ceased. Senator Hall, would you like to close on the committee amendments?

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I rise to urge you to vote against the committee amendments, and I rise to urge you to vote against the committee amendments. The issue has been laid out that this is a point in time at which we are going to vote on whether or not we tax personal property. I don't buy that. I don't see that, I don't understand it. It is not there. The point in time to do that was four days ago when we had a clear shot to decide which direction we wanted to go. This body chose not to as a group. Almost unanimously we chose not to do that. This group of amendments that imposes sales and income tax as an alternative basis is not something that I believe when we know cannot withstand scrutiny even if it becomes part of the bill, it is not something that the voters of the state will support. It is not something members of this Legislature will support, and what we do through rejecting the committee amendments is have LB 1120 in front of us, and I think that is a preferable proposal. I think it is a very good proposal, by the way, notwithstanding the introducer. The issue here before us has been laid out as one of, well, you know, we have to deal with this issue, and we have debated it, and now this is what comes before us. Well, you know, ladies and gentlemen, we had an opportunity early, we had an opportunity earlier to save four days of debate, and decide which direction we wanted to go in the most opportune position any amendment can ever be, and that is as an amendment to the committee amendments on General File where it takes a simple majority. We chose not to do that and now I am going to urge you to reject the committee amendments because they are unfair the way they are currently drafted. They do hit the individual more than they should, although you need to understand that a great portion of them fall on business, as well. So to argue that it is a total shift is erroneous. That is not the case. And to argue that 1120 or the committee amendments in their original form made a shift to individuals is flat out not true. I mean it is true. It is just not accurate. It is not accurate because there is a shift, but the shift was so minute that the argument was that means the ultimate gloom and doom of a constitutional amendment necessary to put in place a change in our system. The committee amendments should not be adopted. The bill should be in front