

property tax exemptions. I don't know why it's inconsistent to have that apply to only personal property exemptions if a ten-year lapse didn't, did only that. This makes sense to broadly address some of these issues as Senator Warner says, but obviously we're here to deal with personal property and I think perhaps there is some consistency here more than meets the eye and more than meets Senator Warner's approval in trying to address some desire to have some level a little higher than normal to address personal property tax exemptions. That's the whole subject matter. So I'm disappointed that the Lindsay amendment didn't get adopted. I think it made sense, but we'll see what happens at this point.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Will, you're next.

SENATOR WILL: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose the Warner amendment at this point. I think that it's, as I said in my closing on the previous amendment, it's a very far-reaching amendment that may have some merit in its own right. I'm not sure that it does have a role to play in the current debate that we're having on the personal property tax issue. I think that probably our focus ought to be at this point on LR 186 on the specific provisions in there that intend to preserve the tax system that exists now in a constitutional fashion and if we want to look at something like the Warner proposal next session, if the 3-R Committee wants to look at it, I think that's an entirely appropriate point at which to examine a provision of this type. I simply don't think that right now this is something we're wanting to get into. I would urge your opposition to it.

PRESIDENT MOUL PRESIDING

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Not on this amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Rod Johnson.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Question.

PRESIDENT MOUL: See sufficient seconds. We'll now vote on the motion to cease debate. All those in favor please vote aye, opposed nay. Please record, Mr. Clerk.