

achieved. And with that, Mr. Speaker, whatever time that I have left I want to relinquish.

SPEAKER BAACK: You don't have any left. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think that one of the things that attracted me to the way that the committee fashioned the amendment in the first place as we advanced the bill out of committee was the fact that we did include a rational basis for classifying property. I think that when you are exempting personal property from the uniformity clause, as this constitutional amendment would do, that it is probably a good idea to include some safeguards as to the types of classifications that are developed pursuant to that. And while I oppose the resolution, itself, and will probably vote against the CA, I think that if we are going to have it, what we need is at least...the very least we can do is include in our State Constitution a rational basis test for categories of property that are subsequently developed. I guess the only qualms that I would have about including the word "rational" in it is that this resolution purports to perpetuate the status quo, if it is adopted by the voters and I think, by including the word "rational" in it, we are probably departing from that goal. With that, I would oppose the amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I, likewise, stand to oppose the amendment. I have been around long enough that I know how these things tend to operate. The message that is probably going around, even if it isn't being talked about, is, gosh, we are into our lunch hour, we need to hurry up and proceed on. We need to get to a vote. What does the amendment do? I am not sure, but the Governor says he wants it. One of the chief lieutenants of the Governor on this measure on the floor is saying that it is the right thing to do, so let's hurry up and get to a vote. Vote yes on it and then we can go off to lunch. I would argue to those of you that are supporting LR 1 and would like to see it ultimately into the Constitution, you are not doing yourselves any favor with this amendment. Keep in mind that 40 votes from the Legislature is not the end of this constitutional amendment. There is somehow that fixation. First of all, there is a fixation that ultimately there will be 40 votes for this constitutional