

July 16, 1991

LB 6
LR 1

on than tax policy, I guess, except maybe our political affiliation. But the fact of the matter is that there is nothing wrong with that. Should we leave this special session and not put a constitutional amendment before the voters, I don't equate that to doing nothing. And that's exactly what we will be accused of by a number of sources. We will be accused of doing nothing, which in effect we are not. What we are doing, after long and deliberate debate, after an extension or expansion of the session we will have been making a conscious choice. Granted, it will be fewer than a majority, possibly, could be a majority who make that decision to not enact a constitutional amendment for the voters to deal with, but a proactive statement, nonetheless, will be made. Don't buy into that argument that nothing has been done. What has been said, when that happens, if that happens, is that we have looked at the options presented to us, we have presented options that have not been adopted. And we, as reasonable people, have not agreed. Now there is nothing wrong with that. And where does that leave us? Does it leave us, as some would argue, with a tax system that is in shambles? No. You've got income tax, sales tax, and property tax. Property tax is levied on real and personal, and it will be levied, and it will be put in place, and MAPCO will be implemented by the county assessors, whether we do LB 6 or not, it will happen, that will happen. But there are those who will tell you that the whole system is a house of cards that will fall if LR 1 or some form of it is not moved out to the voters, who we have no idea whether or not they'd adopt it or not anyway. But then why not give them the option? Because we are sent down here by those same voters, by that same electorate to make policy decisions on taxes, and on other things. And if we, who deal with this day in and day out, cannot agree, cannot agree on this substantive of an issue, pass the buck and, in essence, say, aw, let the people vote on it, just let the people vote on it, that, ladies and gentlemen, is a very yellow-backed way to deal with this issue, because you are not saying let the people vote on it like...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...they have some kind of supernatural informed opinion on real versus personal property. Go back to the debate on just the term "rational" before we recessed for lunch. Now put that into the broader sense of things in a constitutional amendment that is going to run probably close to three pages long that they have to read through, and then check a box that