

March 9, 1992

LB 1063

SENATOR MORRISSEY: ...but a lot of that is labor. I think you need to take a close look at this proposal. First of all, it moves away from the personal property and removes all the uncertainties of LB 1063, all the potential lawsuits that we will continue to face under LB 1063. I truly feel 1063 is just continuing what we have now. You have property being taxed in different manners, exactly what we have now. You have the very real potential for lawsuits in the future to eliminate another, other portions of the tax that will again hit the homeowners. If you're real confident in 1063 and all the figures and everyone has explained to you how it's all going to work and the figures are really accurate, as opposed to my perception...

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: ...of everyone moving forward without questioning 1063, if you're comfortable with those figures, don't worry about your homeowners, but otherwise look at this proposal.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Morrissey. Senator Schmit, you're next.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, Senator Crosby said that she was disappointed by what happened with 1059 and she has every right to be disappointed. Many individuals were disappointed. I think that even the proponents of 1059 were disappointed, not just by cause of the fact that the bill did not do exactly what they wanted it to do, but because we did not then fully fund the bill. But I guess, Senator Crosby, I would ask you this, and that is you followed the leadership of 1059 and you have basically the same individuals who are telling you that 1063 is going to be the savior of this problem, and if you go back in the record, you will find that some of the same people who said that 773 was not going to raise a significant amount of money, oh, maybe 5 to 7 million dollars, 9 at the very most, we found then, to our chagrin, and it took a Governor out of office, that it raised many, many times that amount of money. We were told that it would only raise enough money to take care of the cost of 775. In other words, 7 to 9 million. Instead, 775 has cost the City of Omaha almost that much in a year's time and only God knows how much it has cost revenue-wise for the State of Nebraska. The numbers don't make any sense. The numbers make absolutely no sense. The numbers in 1063, ladies and gentlemen, could be up or down not by millions, but by tens