

good legislation. As I understand the impact of the Lamb amendment, it was to add to LB 3 an exemption for all livestock. And I would like to remind you a little bit of the history of this amendment, although I don't have a lot of specifics as to the number of times that this livestock exemption had been considered by this body as we were debating LB 1063 and the number of times it was rejected, but I know it was a sizeable number of times. We fashioned LB 1063 primarily to tell the people what type of tax policy we had in mind. This is how we are going to tax personal property so that when they went to vote in the primary election they would know what tax policy we had in mind. We considered the exemption of livestock numerous times. We told the people, no, we're not going to exempt livestock. They went to the polls and they voted and they confirmed the constitutional amendment, LR 219CA, with the understanding that livestock was going to be taxed under a depreciated methodology. The Legis...and there was a lot of opposition to the constitutional amendment, saying give the Legislature the opportunity to exempt property. They will not find an exemption they don't like. They will be in there as soon as...as soon as they have an opportunity to start exempting again. They haven't learned anything. You can't trust the Legislature. But the people did trust the Legislature to pass LB...and pass the constitutional amendment. What do we do? As soon as we have an opportunity, we're back in here, we have a bill on Final Reading that once again starts this process of exemption all over again. I think it's bad policy. I think, frankly, I think all of LB 3 is not needed but I think this livestock exemption in LB 3 is one that breaks faith with the people of the state and we ought not to be doing that. We ought to at least wait until we have a regular session, have a bill introduced, allow people to come forward to a committee hearing. As I understand it, this has not had a committee hearing, I don't believe. Maybe it has, I'm not sure. And give them an opportunity to come forward, let the Legislature consider this in an intelligent fashion. A number of concerns also I have about this, since the...since the people voted on the constitutional amendment, we've had another decision that came down from our Supreme Court. Once again, the Supreme Court's sending a message to this body that they do not approve of the way in which the Legislature exempts property. I don't know if you like the decision or not. I don't. I don't. I finally...now somebody that's been somewhat supportive of what the court has done previous to now, I found that they have gone off, in my opinion, the deep end with the Jaksha decision. But