

and really looking at this in the way it should be. I appreciate Senator Vickers' comments about that. I think Senator Landis and I, basically, are trying to get at the same things here, and we are arguing more or less about the "hows" at this point. I don't know if Initiative 300 does all the things that people say it does. I know it does some things that I would prefer to see changed. But I want to know the answers and I want to know that they are technically and legally...they originate from careful study and scrutiny. But I don't want the study dragged out forever either in a stalling mechanism. With that in mind, those are the rationale for this part of the amendment. Let me just comment on Senator Landis's concerns about the first part of this amendment where we essentially drop the requirement that the Governor appoint a balanced committee. I think that when I read that I thought, you know, if I were the Governor, I might be a little offended by this. It is almost as if the Legislature is saying, well, we are clean, and we are trustworthy, but you, Governor, we are going to tell you to be sure and appoint a balanced group to this. I think that is unnecessary. I think both sides, the executive branch and the legislative branch, will genuinely try to appoint a balanced cross-section of people. I think it is just unnecessary language and might be misinterpreted by the Governor, and I suggest that we remove that. The second one on the public hearings, I don't think that they can be taken out across the state in a typical way and get too much in addition to what we already have. I think what we really need here are technical and legal opinions. And then, obviously, whatever comes out has to be shared across the state, should be shared across the state because all of us probably have many of the same questions out there. So, I guess I'm just saying take a little bit of a look at our process. As far as the hearing process goes in western Nebraska, I think if you went out and really talked to people about how satisfied they are with the current hearing process, you wouldn't find a great deal of concern about this particular amendment, because I don't know that our system right now works all that well unless you are very close to the halls of state government. So I think the intent here is to get as good information to give the public and the Legislature something that we can react to and clarify what is, in fact, true and what is not. I think my intention here is to simply get as fair...a fair study and a thorough study that is perceived as being done with serious intent here. That is the reason for changing that word in