

they ask for with a constitutional amendment like the one that we have before us now. All this amendment does is, in my opinion, give us time to deal with this in an orderly fashion. Doesn't strip anybody of their current, I guess, protections, if you will. If anything, it means we have to come back only in January and fight to fund LB 829 again and put those exemptions back in place. But what it does do is a couple of things that I am real interested in and I have stated time and time again that we need to examine our entire tax system. We need to examine our entire tax system, and we need to make recommendations. The Legislature needs to make recommendations, whether they be in the form of the 3-R Committee or whether we meet again informally, maybe, something that I think has been done in the past. We meet again informally to talk about taxes and look at crafting changes to the tax code of this state without stripping the uniformity clause out of the Constitution. That is critically important to me. That is the point at which I will not roll over and support a constitutional amendment. This option doesn't do that. There will be those that argue that, well, you just delay the inevitable. No, you don't. The inevitable will come, but what you are doing now with LR 1CA is that you are asking the voters, in my opinion, to vote something up or down that one could argue they don't clearly understand. And I guarantee you that if they vote it down, there will be those who come back and say that that is a mandate from the voters to put all personal property tax back on the rolls, that they have spoken. And then all of a sudden there will be people who say they didn't understand what they were voting on. The tables will be turned, ladies and gentlemen. That is a risk that you run. I don't believe that that is good tax policy, to come back after probably 20 percent of the electorate decide a tax issue that they aren't clear on. But that is what will happen. There will be those of us who say, no, no, no, the mandate was given, the people have spoken. We have amended our Constitution or not, depending on what the case may be. And then you are faced with no alternative, except for possibly one of the alternatives that Senator Ashford has talked about and others, a percentage, but tax on personal property, nonetheless, on all of it uniformly because they have rejected the other alternative, a moving away from ad valorem for certain types of property, which I would agree would be good tax policy in some instances. But you can't look at that, or at least you shouldn't look at that, until you look at alternative funding mechanisms. How do you pick up the revenue? Who wins, who loses? Those issues aren't addressed in LR 1CA. They are not