

and reenact those exemptions or other form of taxations for personal property and what we do not know of at this point. I know that there are those who once acquire an exemption will, obviously, be opposed to this provision because it means they would have to come back in and justify that exemption on a periodic basis, but errors can be made, and this is one way to make sure that if those errors are made, they are for sure to be reviewed and reenacted in light of the economy and the type of tax system we have on down into the future. Personal property tax has always had a problem of administration; the history of personal property tax is full of problems. Many of us thought that when sales and income tax was enacted in '67 that we were addressing some of those issues, and that followed with the 1970 constitutional amendment to permit classification of tangible personal property just as intangibles and household goods and head tax was repealed in 1967. To me, those who have spoke of concern of how much flexibility the Legislature may have in the future, or that if this is too much...too much flexibility for the Legislature in the future, then this will provide a safety net, a safety precaution that the exemptions or other methods of taxing personal, tangible personal property will, in fact, be reviewed on a periodic basis. I believe it is important, as drafted, it will be a separate constitutional issue on the ballot. There would be two. There would be the one that deals with the amendment that was the committee amendment, that has been so ably presented by Senator Hall, and then this would be a second amendment, which to me, at least, gives the citizens some awareness that there is a built-in protection, and as we move into a route of elimination of the uniformity clause for tangible personal property and moving into exemptions, that there is automatically going to be at least a review of those tax policy decisions every 10 years. I move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Discussion on the Warner amendment? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I rise in support of Senator Warner's amendment, but for purposes of the record, I would ask Senator Warner to respond to a question or two.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Warner, would you respond, please?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.