

interpret what the decision said, drafting a constitutional amendment, and a statutory response. I think that the amount of time that we spent thinking about the decisions and crafting these responses is woefully lacking. I think it is not nearly long enough. I think what we need to do is we need to take some time. We need to study the ramifications of the MAPCO decision. We need to decide exactly what it is needs to be done statutorily, and by way of a constitutional amendment. And I think the main reason that the MAPCO decision leaves us with that allows us to do that is that the remedy that was proposed there was not an equalization to zero of all property, which puts our property tax base at risk. It was a statement by the court that the property that is not taxed should be taxed uniformly and proportionately. There is nothing in that MAPCO decision that indicated that the court's response in the near future would be anything differently when it comes to a remedy. I think what we can do at this point, it is obvious from the array of people that we have in opposition to this at this point, from Senator Lamb, and Senator Hall, myself, Senator Schmit, that this isn't just coming from one point of view, opposition to this legislative resolution. And I think that it would behoove us to take some time to look at a possible response, and whether that means coming back in a subsequent special session, for whatever reason, or waiting until next regular session, I think the court has allowed us some time to craft a response that does not jeopardize some of the things that are important to all of us, and allows us some time to structure a tax system that is one that we can live with, and that isn't put together hurriedly in a special session. I think probably if...more than anything else our responsibility, when we put something before the people of the State of Nebraska, is to put something before them that is understandable, that they can make a proper choice as to what their vote should be. And given the way...we've all seen the way things have worked on the floor, we've had people that have spent years studying this issue, going around not being exactly sure what's in the bill, not being exactly sure what's in the constitutional amendment. And I think if we, who spend our time doing that, aren't exactly sure what's in the constitutional amendment, it's not the responsible thing to do to give this to the people. The responsible thing to do is to craft a constitutional amendment that we all know exactly what the ramifications are in response to a court decision that we all know exactly what it said. And, at this time, that's just not what we're doing. I would urge your opposition to the advancement. Thank you.