

March 6, 1992

LB 1063  
LR 219

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Morrissey, followed by Senator Schmit and Senator Landis. Senator Morrissey.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you, Madam President and members. I'm rising to oppose the constitutional amendment and again I'll explain. Earlier in the session I told my constituents that the worst thing I could do is nothing and have everything go back on. And I am drifting away from that position. We were discussing amongst a group of senators what makes LB 1063 better, what makes 1063 worse, but that's not where I'm coming from. I guess if you could do something similar to 1063 without changing the constitution, I could possibly live with it. If you were basing your tax policy decisions on what is fair, let's do a fair tax system as opposed to let's do a policy that will get us around the fairness clause of the Constitution, maybe I could accept that. If you were basing your tax policy on fairness as opposed to who would suffer the worst, if the worst situation happens, ag, you're going to suffer badly if the worst comes true, so you're going to have to pick up a portion of this bill and that's not the way to go. You don't do it that way. You don't start out crafting a fair tax system by eliminating the fairness and uniformity clause from the Constitution, it's completely backwards. And I have to look at the impact on my district. I was and am concerned about the impact of everything going back on in my district. It will adversely impact the businesses in my district as well as your district wherever you live. So that will be for one year, if that. Everything goes on one year, max, before the clamor is to get us back in here and change things, one year maximum, everything is on. The car dealers start squealing. The heavy inventory businesses start screaming. We're back in here making some changes. So is one year of a bad system enough to break the businesses in my district? I don't know. That's the crossroads I'm at right now. So one year of bad policy versus a long term bad policy of changing the fairness and equal and proportionate clause of a Constitution. If everything goes back on, that's short term in my opinion and I think we all agree we'll be back here addressing that. If you take away the equal and proportionate clause, that is long term, long term. It will not be easy to get that changed again, if you can get it changed, if you can get it out of this body. And people have told me you have to support that politically, you're up for election, you have to support that. So I have to balance again my priorities. Is my priority to stay in this body for another four years and serve