

it ever was because you won't have the problems of the special legislation in those aspects that could well bring you down, bring down the exempting all or more importantly, the uniformity clause requirement in the time between real and tangible personal property. There's only one...you know the only winners out of this argument, probably within the body at least...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...are essentially those who, in fact, would like to see all personal property on the tax rolls at market value and those don't care if that's what happens. Everybody else who recognizes the desirability and the necessity of being able to treat personal property in some other fashion than what the court has now ordered can only accomplish what they would like to see done if this constitutional amendment is on the ballot and the voters approve it. And it makes no sense to me at all to see arguments put forward, put forth that somehow or other the passage of this will deter some of you being able to eventually do what you want to do. As a matter of fact you can only do, in my opinion, what you want to do if this constitutional amendment...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR WARNER: ...is approved.

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

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam Chairman and members, Senator Warner speaks very eloquently about the options and he speaks with years of experience. Senator Warner has never ever said that 829 was unconstitutional. He will never say that I do not believe because he is...most of us in here believe that it is within the power of this Legislature to exempt all personal property. Whether or not we do it remains to be seen but as he also said, you've got that option if you've got the votes. Well Senator Warner knows full well that with a handful, with a baker's dozen of rural senators in this body, some of whom live in rural areas but are not rural, there isn't a chance in the world of getting those votes because if you exempt all personal property it is, very frankly, a little bit of a tax advantage for rural people, but what we are getting into now again is something which I have attempted to avoid throughout this entire debate and that is what course shall we follow? Shall we follow