

March 11, 1992

LB 1063
LR 219

is any problem arguing the issues of LR 219. And Senator Morrissey pointed out the facts in the special session with regard to LB 1 and LB 7 proved to be unconstitutional as well. Much of what is laid out in 219 argues the case that was laid in LB 1 and LB 7 in order to allow them to be constitutional and we talk about the special legislation clause and things like that as if they are an inconvenience, uniformity, special legislation, ex post facto, bill of attainder provisions in our own Constitution and we talk as if those are a bother, those are a troublesome area of our Constitution that we need to do away with so we can get about the business of passing provisions of law, so we can begin to be busy again with ourselves. That's not what we're here about.

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: And what we're here about is to craft a fair tax system, one that is fair to all. This tax system in LB 1063 and the two are so interwoven that they cannot be separated. They are one and the same so they can be talked about at the same time, they must be talked about at the same time. They're so interwoven that they can't be separated. The provisions in the bill are not representative of a fair tax system. All the arguments used against individual taxpayers are going to fall back on 1063. They have in some of the funding mechanisms that were put in place and I guarantee you the people in Omaha, the people in Lincoln and Grand Island and Beatrice, just based on the numbers, and all they have to do is be a little bit off to the bad and...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR HALL: ...there's going to be a tremendous increase in their personal residential property taxes.

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

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, the question is whether or not LB 1063 is constitutional as it stands today and I gave a one-word answer and, no, speaking to the bill as an entirety, because that's why I took the question to be asked. However, to say that the entire bill is unconstitutional which is the other question, the answer is, that's not the case either because every aspect of 1063 that deals with the rolling back of dates of the current system that