

which they made their determinations was not uniformity, or the state's uniformity clause, it was equal protection argument in the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution. That's where they ruled the exemptions unconstitutional. They did not talk about uniformity in the Nebraska Constitution in Section 5 where they threw out the exemptions. They didn't. And, you know, I remember when Professor Lyons was in the committee, and we were debating the inclusion or conversing about the inclusion of all the exemptions, special legislation, and bills of attainder and everything else that we're going to throw in here that would possibly answer all the questions of the court. And he referred to it as a belt and suspenders approach. Bill Lyons said it was a belt and suspenders approach. He said, yes, we're trying to prevent every possible argument. I guess I would argue it's a belt, suspenders and a revoking of the law of gravity so your pants don't fall down approach, because it's throwing in everything, saying well, this isn't going to happen. We're going to guarantee that if you adopt this it isn't going to happen. Ladies and gentlemen, that's not true, that's not true. Short of being able to put up an amendment that says, and the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution doesn't apply, that's the only way you're going to circumvent this process. And think about the argument that Senator Landis makes about the special legislation clause. Far be it from us to pass tax policy that meets that standard. I mean why was special legislation put into the Constitution? To protect against one class of people being given a special type of law to help them, to benefit them. And what we're going to ask the voters to vote on is a constitutional amendment that says that doesn't apply here in terms of personal property. We don't have to deal with it under those conditions. And, ladies and gentlemen, to say that 219, as it would be amended by the committee amendments, is going to protect against all that is just blatantly untrue. It isn't going to happen. The arguments are still there, the court cases are coming, and they are going to be won on one, if not a couple different areas with regard to this provision. It's going to happen. All I'm trying to do is clean up some of the problems that I see in 219. This amendment handles the issue of uniformity. It handles the issue of clarity for the voter who goes to the poll. Maybe the problem with it is it's too simple, it's not complicated enough for some. I would argue that part of our problem has been that we've approached this from a very complicated point of view from day one. What we said is is that how can we figure out...