

the same situation because we drafted it simple enough to be understood clear by, as I think Scott Moore said, Joe Six-Pack, but not drafted in a way that the Supreme Court, with its level of,...

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...how do I diplomatically say this, it's level of interest to interpret that in a way that you and I do not want to see it interpreted. I will put my light on and try to continue to speak. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Withem, you're next.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members. I'll be brief and hopefully give Senator Landis some more time to continue his thoughts, because they are more profound on this issue than mine are. I'm probably closer to Joe Six-Pack on this issue than I am to the level of the constitutional scholars here. And I thank Senator Hall for not pointing out...he pointed out that this concept had been introduced before, but he didn't happen to mention either my name or Senator Hartnett's name as a couple of individuals that have done this in the past. So I appreciate that very much. The concern I have had with constitutional amendment is how much power does the Legislature have, are we giving the Legislature to forget the lessons we've learned here the last two or three years, and reopen the door in terms of exemptions. I read some language in LR 219CA that places some restriction, some options that we have, that I don't think we can just throw out any standards in terms of personal property, that we do have to maintain some degree of...of...some standards in the Constitution by which we have to judge future tax policy. The amendment, as Senator Hall has it written, simply removes from any portion of the taxation code, in terms of what power the Legislature has, any restrictions on personal property. Now, I'm assuming that totally unreasonable classifications might still run afoul of the special legislation section, although I'm not sure if that's referenced in Senator Hall's version. Obviously, the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution would still be there. But I'm uncomfortable with the Joe Six-Pack level of understanding of this, taking away any restrictions, any reference to personal property in the constitutional amendment. So, for that reason, I am not going to support this amendment, and I would give Senator Landis the