

are going to use the excuse that we don't have time to help the voters understand what they are voting on as an excuse not to do this is certainly not the right reason either. I don't think there are 100 percent of the senators on the floor, or off the floor right now, that understand exactly what we are doing either. You know it is a fact of life if we want people to understand how they will be affected, we have to make sure we have that obligation, and this debate on the floor with this issue identifies that. We are maybe not prepared to do either. In fact, as you all know, there will be some people who will support 1063 and maybe a constitutional amendment who will advertise and politicize the issue with the full intention of hoping that people do not understand what they are voting for because we are really not changing a heck of a lot. Most of the debate has simply had to do with how to protect the exemptions that exist and how to shift those responsibilities without admitting it. I think the 3-R Committee and everybody else had enough time to understand other alternatives, and Senator Elmer's proposal is one of those, but we never took the time, and that is the problem. We are simply limiting what we are willing to talk about, and by doing that, we, obviously, have to admit to everybody in the state that we are not providing any kind of stability from a tax point of view for anybody. That whatever we do, based on what we have all heard so far, certainly is not a permanent solution at all. It is not substantive at all. Whether we understand it or not, what Senator Elmer recommends does more to do that than anything we have discussed so far. What I would like to suggest is, unfortunately and it couldn't have happened, is that the proposal by Senator Elmer could have been provided in such a way that it could have stood on its own and competed with everything we are talking about at the present time. So what we want to do is to make sure that all of us understand the responsibility we have, and not try to fool people into thinking that what we are trying to do will have long-lasting effects and offer stability for all of us in the future. It has already been discussed this morning that many of the amendments we have proposed are probably going to be subject to litigation, and, in fact, Senator Moore even suggested we'd better come up with some more money to provide for our obviously competent Attorney General, enough money to hire somebody who is equally as competent to help defend us against those kinds of litigation. But let's not fool people also into thinking that what we are trying to do is to help them through this terrible issue in such a way that it will, in fact, go away. Owen offers us a chance with this