

listening and I hope that the rest of you will consider Senator Will's argument.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Pirsch, you're next.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the body, I...I've had my light on several times and once was to address this when it first came up, saying but what are we doing, Senator Hall? And I guess I ask that question again and particularly after the constitutional amendment failed to pass. It's still the same question. What does this accomplish? What are we really doing? We're talking about sending a constitutional amendment proposal to the voters so they can vote twice on something that we cannot agree on and we're just saying, vote the first time to agree with us, not to agree on something that we want you to vote again on in November possibly. I...I think it's asinine, quite frankly, and has been the exact opposite of what I thought Senator Hall wanted to accomplish. I can understand why some would embrace this but, Senator Hall, I would like to ask you a question. At one time, you said that you wanted to make a strong...to make that committee, the 3-R Committee, a very strong committee to look at all of our tax proposals and to use that committee in...and give them as much direction or lack of direction to go as freely as they can. How would this give them any sense of direction if we are saying that we now will take everything off?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Hall, would you respond, please.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Senator Pirsch. Senator Pirsch, we've taken everything off. We have agreed to this concept. Remember LB 829? Final Reading on LB 829 with the emergency clause was voting in the affirmative, 35 members; voting in the negative, 12 members.

SENATOR PIRSCH: But you have...

SENATOR HALL: You're being consistent because you voted in the negative on LB 829. But we have...we have...last session...

SENATOR PIRSCH: And I...and I thought that you were opposed to that also.

SENATOR HALL: That's correct.