

August 7, 1992      LB 1, 3

can be made it's as within the call as LB 3 or LB 1, in my opinion, I think it should stay in, I think it should pass. I see no reason to continue this, I wouldn't call it overly burdensome, because it's not, it's not overly burdensome on the purchaser, obviously they get their money back. And so that's good. But I don't know why you have to wait until January 1, '94 to make the thing make sense. We have every ability, under LB 3, to do it now, I think that's...save some money in the time being, and I just think it's that simple. And that's the last I'm going to say. I hope the amendment stays in.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Robak. Senator Robak. Senator Will, followed by Senators Bohlke and Robinson.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I, once again, rise in support of the Hall amendment to LB 3. I think the merits of the issue have been discussed thoroughly. I think what I'd like to say is that the larger issue here is the purpose that we're here for, and that is to simply reenact LB 1063. I voted to advance LB 3 from the Revenue Committee because it contains some technical changes, the way that we amended it, that I thought enhanced LB 1063 without substantively changing it. I think that the Moore amendment does substantively change LB 1063, as I stated earlier. Frankly, probably we would have been better off simply to have indefinitely postponed LB 3 in committee and avoided substantive issues altogether, although that may...probably wouldn't have accomplished that either. But I think the purpose of the Special Session, as I just stated, is to reenact LB 1063, purely and simply. I think to continue to have the Moore amendment in LB 3, to not adopt the Hall amendment is a dangerous first step in departing from the compromise that was reached on LB 1063. I think whether you're an opponent of LB 1063, whether you were a reluctant supporter, as I was, no matter where you stood on that issue, I think that we need to unite now, acknowledge the fact that the people of the state have adopted a constitutional amendment, the results of which are reflected in LB 1063. We need to simply get about our business and reenact that bill without departing from the agreement that was reached, which I think that LB 3, in its current form, certainly does. I don't think that at this point we want to begin the process of dismantling LB 1063. That may be something that is an issue for the upcoming regular session of the Legislature. I think it's a dangerous step to take at this point, because if you want to