

Apparently, of course, Senator Schmit was opposed to 1059 in the first place, and he argued, not only against 1059, but for the 2 percent lid. But beyond that particular point, the thing that people must understand and remember about 1059 is if you were in a school district that made...that gained a lot of money from the state, that meant that you were a net loser, because your tax base was so ridiculously gone and low that you had a total inability for an equal education for your children. We had to come in and give you money so you could be equal. So any district that is losing money, on the one hand, the argument is not that they are losing money, but now they finally have a tax base that they have local control, that they can educate their children with their control, with their tax base. I wish North Platte were losing money, if LR 1 passed, because that would mean our tax base is such that we can educate our own. That is a red herring, and it's not applicable to this issue. The other one Senator Will brought up was that we haven't had enough time. That's nonsense. Now, in the last ten days of last session we had a myriad of issues we had to cover. We had to cover a tremendous number of issues on overrides, on budget requests, on other bills, and this as well. If we would have been...if this would have been during a regular session, as Senator Will suggests, next January coming back, and we spent this much time on this issue, people would be saying we spent enough time, let's move on, there's other things to talk about. We have spent more time on this issue during this session than we ever would be able to spend with in a general session with the other issues. And the members in the body know that. Senator Will, that is a red herring, and you know that. One of the things that I think we need to constantly remind ourselves is let us assume for a minute that we do not pass LR 1. Let us assume that the 3-R Committee, which Senator Hall is trying to try to get to do what...an overall tax policy that deals with taxation, and I understand that, Senator Hall, I understand that. Let's assume that they do an overall tax adjustment, and they look at taxes, they look at the revenue, they look at exemptions, they look at everything and they decide they want to do something. At some point what would we have to do? We would have to go to the public and ask for a constitutional amendment. And the constitutional amendment would have to ask what? Remove the uniformity clause. And where do you think the discussion would be next session? The discussion would be, well, what is there to, if we're taking the uniformity clause, what protections are there going to be, and we'd be in the middle of a 30 vote, 25 vote argument. Why people think that, if we hold off and