

those who support the bills that are before us, more clarification on what the court meant. We're clearly doing that and the sunset would make that very, very clear that that is what this body was asking of the court. Now I come from the point of view that we shouldn't do that and I don't intend to support LB 7 even with the sunset provision on it, but I do think that that then is a very honest approach to what we are here about. And we are here about, in my opinion, to give us an idea as to where we currently stand. Unless I misread the newspaper articles and unless I misheard the arguments on behalf of this legislation. That is why I thought we were here. The arguments with regard to protecting the tax base really are, I don't think, arguments that, first of all, anybody agrees on what the tax base is and we've all clearly said that that is not going to happen because we're going to cover that short-fall should there be one. The amendment I think is an amendment and a vote on whether you ever intend to change the system, whether you ever intend to have a long-term solution to the problem. I would argue that LB 1, LB 2 and LB 7 are, in effect, without the sunset in this provision, an offering that says here's what we're going to do, but no more. And unless you sunset this exemption, you are not telling the court that you do intend to fix the system, you do intend to have a long-term solution, you do, as a body, intend to come in in 1990 and work toward that end. The sunset allows those cases that are currently being litigated to flush through the system. It allows for that process to take place. It clearly allows for not only the centrally assessed issue, but the locally assessed issue to be addressed. It clearly allows for us to know where we stand and to deal with that. If you don't put the sunset on it, what have you done? I think you've sent the message to the courts that will work very much toward the end of those who are litigating these cases. It would say, your system is unfair, your system is unjust. What you're telling them is that no, the message we want to send you is that we don't want 75 percent of our base exempted, we want 80. And you can wax eloquently about the 4-R Act I guess as long as we want to listen to it, but that is not really the issue. And that may have been the issue in a couple cases and it may be the issue in particular to the railroad rolling stock, and Senator Warner is I think very correct when he says that when you put this classification together that it will be one that would be upheld by the courts as a rational classification, but that does not address our entire system. And our entire system is what is being attacked. It is not just the railroad rolling stock, it is not just the 4-R Act that we