

members, I would oppose Senator DeCamp's amendment for the simple reason that I don't think the public is going to like this. If I make a complaint, I am unhappy, and when I... I want to meet with, I want to eyeball the board of supervisors or whoever was elected to do the job, not some hired man, and I am going to feel better about it. No doubt, the hired person might do a better job, but that is not the fellow I know and I want to have the satisfaction of telling this board of supervisors exactly how I feel about it. I don't think the board of supervisors in any county are going to shirk their responsibility. They were hired to do a job and if they don't do it they won't be re-elected. I don't think they would even approve of this bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp, do you wish to close on your amendment?

SENATOR DeCAMP: Yes. I think you guys are pimping me. Yes, Senator Newell, Senator Nichol...oh, my goodness. Oh, my goodness, we need a public hearing. Now old John got up yesterday and he says, hey, look, you know, you have got an innocent bill here, it does something completely different than anybody dreams. He told you, if I am wrong...if I am wrong I will just get down on my knees and apologize and say, oh, you smart folks I was wrong, but if I am right I just suggested you go back...I didn't even make the motion for a public hearing. I just suggested you go back, find out what your amendment did that you admitted nobody knew. So now today on something that has had a public hearing, that isn't that a big a deal, it is merely optional, gives an additional tool of the county... why we have got all kinds of new found fervor to have public hearings over the doggone thing. I am one of those that traditionally opposes sending bills back for public hearings thinking that we are smart enough most of the time after we have had a public hearing on the subject that we can decide it. If you want to adopt the amendment and send it back for a public hearing because of all this new found information, that is fine, that is fine. But the issue is pretty simple, don't sit here and claim that equalization is in a wonderful state in this state. Equalization was the most screwed up thing that this state had for the last ten years. Equalization was a disaster, and it is a crock of bull to claim otherwise. Don't act noble and say, oh it is wonderful. It is screwed up. Now if you can provide an additional tool to have additional information, you are not mandating it, what is so terrible about that? Is making a determination... making a determination over what somebody's whole life rests on, their farm, their house, is making that determination