

whatever...if, indeed, the 3-R Committee actually does come up with something, I mean, I can just see the lobby getting cut loose, and it's going to be awful hard to ever put anything back on the tax rolls. I think what I strongly encourage the body to do is to oppose Senator Lamb's amendment. I know there is an amendment coming up somewhere that is going to...try and return the status quo in '92. And the status quo taxes centrally assessed business property, taxes business equipment. The status quo does not tax livestock, grain inventory, business inventory, and farm machinery. That's what status quo is. That's what...if your argument is take out the hammer, then do that. I fully support that, particularly, I think it's imperative to take that out after the action of this body this morning when they rolled over and said all taxpayers are created equal, but some of them are more equal than others, by refusing Senator Hall's amendment. Now I support that. But Senator Lamb's amendment takes it a step a lot further than that, because Senator Lamb's amendment will exempt all personal property forever, and gets a little bit further than we need to go. I think, in adherence to the court, we could do it for one year in tax year '91, but we don't need to do it in '92 and beyond until we look at the whole mix. And so I just think Senator Lamb's amendment goes too far, for that reason, I oppose it and will support amendments later on that will return the status quo in '92, if the attitude is you shouldn't have a hammer.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I'm in opposition to Senator Lamb's amendment. There are really, in my case, two particular watershed issues on this measure. I'm supportive of the Governor's plan, as I understand it to date. There may be some tweaking around, around the edges, making some adjustments, and those will be fine. But there are really two lines in the sand, as far as I'm concerned. Those are, first of all, if we're going to temporarily take everything off the tax rolls, who's going to pay for that? And I think the answer has to be as close as this body can fashion a plan that as those people, who benefit by a temporary solution of taking everything off, then would receive the burden of paying for that. I'm going to support that, if it gets to the point where the general populace has to pay for taking everything off the tax rolls, then I'm going to be in opposition, that's point number one. Point number two, is this particular line in the sand right