

SENATOR LANDIS: Line 21?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: On page 11.

SENATOR LANDIS: That would be line 18, but, yes, correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, right, but to get into the text, so then when we turn the page what we're dealing with is the word "taxpayers" which will be changed to the word "appellant".

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And we'll change "have" to "has". Now, you say that this has never been used for the purpose of obtaining a win for everybody similarly situated to the individual who filed the appeal.

SENATOR LANDIS: To my knowledge, in tax valuation cases the answer is yes, to my knowledge.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, then as the man who was addressing a group of people in one of those asylums asked, then why are we here? And one of them said, because we're not all there, but that won't suffice here.

SENATOR LANDIS: (Laugh.) Right, I'll tell you why.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR LANDIS: Because the text arguably could support a class action and because of the word "shall" which is our legislative mandate here to grant remedy...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Ummm, hmmm.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...we may be ordering the court under this to grant class action remedy, something that we did not intend to do nor which has been a past practice, but which in this round some of our very quick-witted and probably highest paid lawyers have couched their appeals to the court in the form of. Heretofore, they have not but now they have.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So you're saying right now there are pending before the court appeals which would entitle everybody similarly