

and then the amendment, because I know that they are sincere in what they are trying to do, but I really think that we are at that point, and I may just withdraw my amendments even, because I don't think anyone wants to answer any questions. I do not know if anyone can answer questions. Questions have been avoided all afternoon. This body had to violate their own rules on reconsideration and their own rules on cloture because they were in such an intense haste to move a bill across the board that did not need to be moved and which is not in a position to be moved. To amend the Constitution in this manner is irresponsible. To expect the people to adopt the amendment is total irresponsibility. If it is not adopted, then perhaps the goal, perhaps the goal of certain individuals will have been met, and all personal property will go back on the tax rolls. I would have to...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...say that perhaps at this point, and I have not made a decision yet for certain, but at this point I may withdraw my amendments rather than to participate in a travesty and a charade, an abominable practice which I abhor, and which you will learn later on will cause you difficulties. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schmit. Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President and members of the Legislature. Certainly one of the things that causes me some problem with this date is that you do close off the class, and I know we want to talk policy, but at some point in time, the Constitution does require at least some technical examination of what you are trying to do. If you put in that date of December 31, 1992, from thereon, you create a closed class. And so you have a treatment of that set of exemptions, and then you put in the special legislation requirement. The other exemptions in MAPCO, and so on, that were thrown out were thrown out because of the uniformity clause, and not necessarily because of the special legislation clause. And what this attempts to do is say that prior to December 31, 1992, anything that was in, if it was okay with the uniformity clause, it was all right, but after this date, then you are going to have to shift over to the special legislation clause, and that is what causes me the great problems with the date. You ought to have one standard, and whatever that standard is, that is what you should live with and doing. There is a legitimate discussion of