

why, when you have a lot of the state already up in arms not knowing what it is is actually going to happen with this amendment and legislative bills and whether they pay personal property tax or whether they don't, why we need to add this other element of uncertainty to the picture and it just doesn't make any particular sense to me at this time to do this, to go and particularly when we talk about things flying politically or not flying politically to go back home next week and explain to your constituents back home that you've given them the opportunity to once again pay property tax on their refrigerators, their fur coats, their diamond rings and all of these other things we talked about. It just makes absolutely no sense and I've yet to be convinced it's a good idea and I would suggest to people that they do not support this particular amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members, I rise to oppose the amendment as well. I guess I don't understand the rationale because I fully expect after this amendment to see an amendment that would strip, for example, on page 78, subsection b, lines 15 to 20 of the bill that spell out exactly what will happen if the constitutional amendment doesn't pass. If we're not to put into place those provisions that, what if scenarios, if you will, then I would fully expect to see the proponents of this measure strip all those provisions from 1063 or the amendment to it so that there is not any, I guess, scare tactics with regard to how people vote on the constitutional amendment or not. And the issue with regard to, you know, just so people are informed, Senator Withem, on the issue of dissenting opinion since much of the discussion refuting that has been from concurring opinions, I guess I would argue that what's the difference between a concurring opinion and a dissenting opinion with regard to the weight of it, there probably is no difference. It's the majority opinion, what it took to get everyone to buy into the final product that lays out the groundwork or the rationale for the decision by the court. All the concurring opinions do is say, here's why I did what I did. All the dissent does is say, here I went in a different direction. I would argue that the dissent and the concurring opinions hold the same amount of weight and much of the arguments in opposition to these proposals have been extracted from concurring opinions and hold no more weight than a dissent does.