

we'll look at that issue again and make changes to reflect what we were told would happen with the passage of that bill some years ago. And likewise, LB 775 was sold as doing one thing, and ended up doing a much different impact. And I'm accumulating data on that, that I will share with you in the near future, that will show a dramatic impact and tax loss to the State of Nebraska, far beyond anything envisioned in the passage of that bill. We must be willing, on tax policy, to take new routes and try new ideas perhaps to try to better our tax policy. At the same time we need to be aware of consequences of the changes and be willing to change when we have the information come back indicating that the shifts involved were not what we anticipated, that the shifts involved may be harmful. And I'm not saying that ultimately LB 1063 will disappoint us to the degree that perhaps Senator Moore thinks it will, but it's possible, and it's something we need to be aware of, and again be willing to adjust this policy in the future, as I hope we will adjust the policy in a couple of other areas in the future on tax, taxes in our state. With that, I do rise in support of LB 1, acknowledging that we need to pass it, and hoping that others will likewise support the legislation and not try to make the changes overall this session, this Special Session, but that we will wait until the facts come in over the next few months, that next year, in the 1993 session, we will be willing to reexamine the issue and find ways to improve upon it.

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

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Madam President, members of the Legislature, I, too, would view some of the comments like the revisited past discussions. One thing you need to remember through all this discussion, because you've got to start back with the regular session in 1991 when we started to attempt to address this issue, and we were in a position, as we were in the regular session of 1992, of trying to get 40 votes for a constitutional amendment. Now, there were those who felt that was unnecessary. But it has become abundantly clear, obviously, since the more recent Supreme Court decisions, that the constitutional amendment was necessary. In fact, one of the opponents, a very strong opponent publicly to the adoption of 1063, outside of the Legislature, appeared in support of the enactment of LB 1. And in questions that I asked him I asked did he believe that the policy that he would like to see in the taxation of personal property was possible under the Constitution prior to the adoption of Constitutional