

November 10, 1992 LB 1

we come to the auditor who is working with him on certain issues that he wants to have done, he will make a ruling that although the Constitution says that an executive officer has to live at...or reside at the seat of government it doesn't mean what it says. Then we have a bill of this kind, with this type of provision, it raises the types of questions that will cause the public to wonder and it certainly causes me to wonder which of you could say that if you went out to the public and told them what I'm saying here, they would say, oh, that's just a coincidence, nothing significant there. This that Senator Warner is attempting ought not be done for several reasons and, at this point, I'm not going to repeat all of the things that I said earlier...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...because I think, even before I said those things, everybody on this floor was well aware of them anyway. But forces are at work or at play on this bill which I think are detrimental to the Legislature, and we always wind up being the fall person, the Legislature did it. Well, now the Legislature knows and the public knows if the media will do their job. I had told a person from the Governor's office I would support LB 1, but if this is done, I certainly shall not. And I think this bill is going to need every vote that it can get. I hope that Senator Warner's motion to suspend the rules will be defeated.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members, I rise to support the motion to suspend the rules. But I will tell you what, if somebody had come and talked to the Revenue Committee and been honest about what this provision did, we wouldn't be here right now. And that's...that's what irritates me to no end. I mean, you know, we think sometimes that the Supreme Court holds us in disdain, as a body, I don't know that everybody doesn't if this is the way we're treated. Let's see if they don't raise the question, if they don't ask, let's not tell them. Let's just see if they slide it on through. That's not the way I'm used to being treated and that sure isn't the way I treat people. But that being as it is, the purpose behind the rule suspension is because it's the method in which we have to get at this amendment and the argument in relation to personal property and the property factor, as it relates to