

March 11, 1992

LB 1063

LR 219

technical changes that, if it's adopted, that need to be made to the amendment itself, I rise to support it. You know, the problem is is that...and I read...finally read the editorial the other day in the paper that said I was playing with fire, in essence, I was being a friend of agriculture and I was...I was looking at real problems down the road. Ladies and gentlemen, I would argue that what this state needs is a little revolution. A little revolution is good for the soul and that's exactly what we need to be doing. I mean, a short synopsis of what we're doing in 219 and LB 1063 is we're saying, well, you know, the court said we can't have this many exemptions, we can't discriminate. So in order to have this discriminatory tax policy that our Constitution doesn't allow, we need you voters to enact this constitutional amendment that strikes all your protections as it relates to special legislation, discrimination, ex post facto, and as a matter of fact we're going to make it retroactive to January 1 of this year. Hope you understand that. Appreciate your support for it. That's the way the constitutional amendment ought to read because that they would understand. And then they would vote very clearly no in the no box for it. And I would argue that they're still going to do that. They're going to do that whether it be May or whether it be November. And, frankly, I hope it's November. I think that it clearly ought to be something that people have an opportunity to look at over a period of time. I mean, we just adopted an amendment to it today on March 11. If it goes on the ballot, it's not going to be in final form until tomorrow, March 12. If it goes on the ballot in May, that's less than two months for them to take a look at it and digest it. This provision says let's look at both options, let's give them a fair shot at deciding which way they want to go. And, granted, as I stated earlier, there is problems with the specifics of the amendment as Senator Moore has it in just a technical nature, not in how they're drafted but just some technical changes that need to be amended into it once it's adopted to the LR. There is an article that's in the February edition of the Creighton Law Review. Actually, there's a couple of articles, one of them by our own esteemed Senator Douglas Kristensen, on the Nebraska Court of Appeals. But another one that's written by a woman who happens to be a tax attorney and her name is Deborah L. Keith. It is an extremely interesting, although very light, article in terms of where the personal property tax issue has gone in Nebraska. It's very readable. It's not as technical as much of the stuff that has been passed out on the floor by myself and other members. And it's a quick read. And it also is a little