

enactment. I, again, they say that all through this document. You can do it, it just has to be real, based in reality. I listened, I respect what Senator Warner has to say and I can prove that because I stood up and changed my vote after what Senator Warner said on LB 1 and LB 7. I think now in reflecting back, it was the wrong thing to do, but we can all have disagreements but no one is necessarily right or wrong. Again, I think they're telling us you can classify, but it must be based in reality and no one has yet answered the question on 4-R and I don't know that anyone will and I would hope that possibly the press would ask that question. Maybe this gets us by our Constitution, but does it get us by 4-R, because that's the real answer, that's the real answer. What percentages are the real numbers that are going to kick 4-R in? And I don't know, and that's why I think if you truly want to avoid these problems down the road, you move to a system that removes personal property. Again, I think the Constitution clearly allows us to do it. I think the judges have clearly said we could do it. If you really want to avoid hassling over this in the future, you figure out a way around 4-R and the only way I see around it is to not tax personal property. Again I would wonder why the courts set an early or late April date on the Jaksha case. It really is something I've thought about the last couple days because, you know, if they would have met early in January, maybe they don't meet then, I'm not really up on when the Supreme Court works and when they don't, but I think they probably have the ability to meet whenever they want and to hear pivotal cases in a timely manner unless they don't...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: ...want to be the ones to make the decision. They don't want to be the ones, let's see if this little bit of information we've given them so far and some would say it's plenty of information, but they still left that question that reasoned people are disagreeing on on the classification between real and personal. They can clarify that. They could have clarified it already, but they don't want to or they don't have time to and for some reason they just haven't done it. It would have helped. Maybe they don't want to make the decision, maybe it's a pass the buck, to leave it up to us and, but I really don't think if we would take off all personal property that the Supreme Court would make that decision. Again, it would be one way to get your name in the history book, but it's a way I wouldn't want to...a path I wouldn't want to pursue to make