until we move farther into that arena and closer to a solution, I cannot support LR 2CA. It is not on the basis that I think we should not help the rural sectors of the state. I clearly think that they do look at life in a different way and they are dealt with sometimes very cruelly by mother nature and that's something that, as much as we would like to, we cannot even legislate. But the fact of the matter is, is that should we...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...adopt LR 2CA, the biggest problem with it, in my opinion, is the impediment that it places out there for us with regard to the overall solution of property tax relief. It's not an issue of should this or should this not be done. I think this wagon train is rolling and there is no chance to stop it at this point and I don't intend to. It's the last time I'm going to speak on the issue. But I do believe that it is something that we should think long and hard about and know that when...with the passage of it that the problem is not solved, that it is not a solution in itself, that we have to continue looking at the issue of overreliance on property tax for the funding of local government. And until we correct that overreliance, we do not correct the problem. With that, Mr. President, I would again urge the body to adopt Senator Johnson's amendment to LR 2CA. Thank you.

SPEAKER EARRETT: Thank you. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, Mr. President and members, again I want to say that I appreciate and commend Senator Johnson for his work in this area. Although I do not always agree with what he is doing, I think that he does recognize the serious problem we have, and he's attempting to do something about it, which is always commendable. I do think, Senator Johnson, that your amendment ought to go a little farther, if you're going to try to address the number three item on your memo, because I believe at the present time, although it may well be that the amendment, as drafted, would not allow for disparate treatment of land within the class. I believe that really there ought to be an amendment, and I do not have one prepared, that would spell it out. And there ought to be some language added, and I think we ought to take a look at it, that specifically said, after the word "franchises", except that there shall not be disparate treatment within the class, because at the present time I believe, notwithstanding, notwithstanding the other language we