

ing their property tax assessment, keeping it at the rate it was before the project was completed and for fifteen years they do not get the...

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Okay. For fifteen years at that point they have a tax differential that goes into repaying the bonds, that is to say that there is the increase in property taxes but it all goes to pay back the bonds that are used by the city to support the project. So I think it is fairly clear that you have fifteen years after the project has increased the valuation to keep that valuation, as far as the city tax coffers go, at the old rate of return and then the increased money goes into repay those bonds. So I don't understand exactly where the interpretation problem comes in. And fifteen years is more than the typical bond is sold for I believe. Twelve years is what your average bond is sold for and that seems to me to be adequate then under the fifteen year provision that was adopted in '78. So I support the Warner amendment and oppose the bill.

PRESIDENT: All right, the Chair recognizes Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President and members, I, too, rise to support Senator Warner in his motion to bring this bill back to strike the enacting clause. As many of you know, I have fought this type of expansion of various methods to fund the blighted areas across this state all this session. The simple fact of the matter is, the issue that we're talking about is what is a fair tax and of course we all know the only fair tax is one that the other guy pays and I think that is what this issue is all about. If we can get certain businesses, certain individuals to build in certain areas that might be called substandard, and Senator Goodrich mentioned they could be in the downtown areas of many towns and that is true, then we can let those people have certain property tax breaks for a longer period of time with this bill. Well I suggest to you that the other property taxpayers are going to be picking up the difference for a longer period of time. Nobody seems to be talking about that. We're granting an extension of a refund, if you will, or a lesser amount, to certain people but at the same time somebody else is going to have to be paying a larger amount for a longer period of time, somebody else that might, in fact, be in the same business that this particular individual or business might be in. It is an example of the government intervening in private business and trying to throw dollars at a problem and see if they can make the problem go away. I don't think that will work. I think the people of this state should not have to be subjected to legislating in the Constitution for that sort of