

March 10, 1992

LB 1063
LR 219

and I think the question needs to be discussed. It has been discussed here, and I would urge that there be more discussion on these specific points. But to not make a distinction, as Senator Lindsay puts in place here, I think runs afoul of the constitutional amendment's intent itself, and I just...I think that...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...it is better to argue against the amendment in terms of I guess a future reference with regard to exemptions than it is to strike the provision that is a date certain because it does give some certainty to the issue and something to anchor it to. Otherwise, it goes back to an issue of, is the whole proposal, and I would guess it does anyway, with or without the Kristensen amendment, but is the whole proposal unconstitutional just merely based on the fact that it purports itself to be retroactive to a January 1 date, and that the bill, itself, is, LB 1063, the accompanying legislation, is unconstitutional on its face because we are knowingly passing a proposal that is unconstitutional at the time that it becomes law? So with that, I would urge you to vote against the Kristensen amendment to the Lindsay amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam Chairman, members of the body, I would just suggest that once again the constitutional amendment which we are working on here today is going to go before the people, and for those of you who had any doubt, we are submitting a lose, lose proposal to the people. Senator Kristensen's approach and Senator Lindsay's approach is an open admission that they are concerned with the proposal. I do not think, as Senator Kristensen has pointed out, that you can put a closed class in the Constitution. I think you have serious problems and this court has become very strict constructionist. I do not look liberally upon this sort of activity and I would hope that when they look at the bill, if it gets there, and look at the Constitution and see the treatment that both have received, that they would act accordingly. What is of most concern to me is the clever manner in which the constitutional amendment has been drafted. It has been drafted in a manner that is a lose, lose situation for many people in this state. The rural members ought to know, and for the record, I want to be certain that everyone else will know, that if the constitutional amendment