

March 12, 1992

LB 829

LR 219

something they were willing to do and they, by a large majority, said we're not going to do that. We can... somebody might try to say, well, gee, we don't want to put everything on the tax rolls, maybe we can institute an extension of 829 again, bring that one back. And, quite honestly, I think that will not necessarily... I don't think that will be successful in the body. I don't think that will be the case. Consequently, I think, this is just from my point of view, and I've thought very hard on this particular subject, that if the body, in its wisdom, has said we're going to put the matter in front of the public, let's put the matter in front of the public in May. Let's find out now. Let's don't go through the agony of is 829 going to be extended? Is it going to be constitutional? Can they get the warrants? Can they bond? Are we going to put them in even more difficulties, the political subdivisions now, because we decided to do it in November instead of May? The decision has been made. We want to put this and are going to put this in front of the public. Let's go ahead and do it then in May. That's not unreasonable to ask. This is not a vote on do we want to do a CA or not. This is just a vote on when it's the most proper, when it's the most responsible, when it's the most desirable portion of time to have this before the body, before the public. I think if you extend it into November, the process in the middle causes much more problems than if we do it in May. I would urge the body, at this point to reconsider our first vote and then to say we have decided that we are going to do the CA, let's do it in May, let's do it and get it over with, get it to the public and then we go from there. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Hall, followed by Senators Landis, Abboud, Elmer, Schmit, Lynch, Hefner, Schrock, Withem and Ashford. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members, I rise to oppose the motion to reconsider. The issue is clearly more than one of at what point in time we take the vote. The system, if that were the case, there would be no different standard for whether an issue is on a primary ballot or a special election as opposed to a general election. That's what our rules require. That's what the... it says it takes 40 votes, four-fifths majority as opposed to 30 votes on a general ballot. It is not merely just a timing issue. The purpose behind that is so that the majority does not have the ability to run roughshod over the minority. I won't say that has happened here. I think there