

Legislature than Senator Lamb does. I've been here only seven years, but I've learned to know in seven years that this group of people can do the right thing, and they do do the right thing on many, many occasions, and we do work together. I resent the fact that the press has played up on the urban-rural split in the Legislature. I think if they paid attention to the facts, which doesn't seem to bother the press in most cases, they would find that that does not exist in this body. We don't have that urban-rural split that they continue to talk about, it's not there. We help with each other's problems, and we try to help solve each other's problems. If we'd put this on the ballot, does the constitutional amendment pass? I don't know if it does, I don't know if it does or not. I think it's going to be a very difficult job to get it to pass, I think we're going to have to do a good education campaign of the voters in this state to try to get them to vote for the constitutional amendment. It's not going to be easy. I think that as a member of the 3-R Committee, I think we need this constitutional amendment to allow us the flexibility to look at the entire system. I disagree with Senator Hall totally there. We can't even look at the entire system if we do not have this kind of flexibility, we don't have the ability to do that, because coming back we have to put all property back on. And we cannot talk about exemptions, because they won't exist anymore. Everything has to be there. And I think that the 3-R Committee needs that kind of flexibility to look at those...at that situation. I think that Senator Landis said the thing that's the most important in this whole thing, and I agree with that, is who is going to set the tax policy of this state. I think that, if we don't do it through passing...putting LR 1 on the ballot and allow the people to vote on that, we are saying we are abdicating our responsibility here. We are allowing the courts to set the tax policy of this state. And Senator Hall can say they only talked about tax year 1990, and they did. But there is nothing to preclude them from talking about '91 in the next decision that comes down. I know that there's been some talk saying, well if they file a case now it's going to take a whole year before that case comes before the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has plenty of cases before it now to make the kinds of...the kinds of statements that they want to make about our tax policy. We don't have to wait for a new case to do that. They can do that now, and they can do it very, very quickly. I also think that we cannot say that our real estate tax system isn't still at risk. I think there still is that possibility, that it still is at risk. I don't think that that's precluded at all in the