

will pass, what the alternatives might be. And it's my opinion that LR 2CA is probably our best route to provide some long-term solution to the problem if we want to preserve an income earning formula in the state. If we do not, if we want to go to market value, then we can simply do that, we don't need the amendment. But I guess I am one who still supports the idea that the earnings capacity approach is the fairest approach, is working even though there are some concerns the Supreme Court has raised with it and I think that most farm groups I have talked with, most agricultural individuals seem to support the concept of keeping it in place. And this is, as I view the issue, is one of the only ways that we can actually keep earnings in place for a long period of time. So, with that, I will close on my opening and just simply say that I would ask for the support of the amendment which, basically, clarifies some of the concerns that the Attorney General has pointed out to us.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion on the amendment offered by Senator Johnson? Senator Landis, would you care to discuss the amendment, followed by Senator Hall.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislature, I support the Johnson amendment and in turn support LR C2...LR 2CA, rather. My rationale for doing so goes back to an analysis of the voting pattern on Amendment 4 several years ago, a pattern that surprised me, a pattern that I had not personally endorsed prior to the election when in a special session I had voted against placing that measure on the ballot. But, you know, it seems to me that we need to pay attention to those rare exertions of the public will that constitute statewide elections on issues. Frankly, I believe in LB 662, in compulsory reorganization. On the other hand, it seems to me that the public has spoken on that subject at least for a period of time and I have abided by that by not introducing a measure that replicates that issue. Others in this body believe strongly on the seat belt issue but the public spoke and this body has not endorsed a bill or even brought one forward in recognition of what the public did and what they said. Well, even as we have honored what the public has done in the negative by not doing those things which the public has told us through their votes that they don't want us to do, so, too, if you flip that around, the mirror image is it seems to me that it's incumbent on us to do the things that the public has told us that they want through statewide elections of the people. And what they told us in Amendment 4 was, we support a form of