

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Mr. President and members, I turned on my light, actually, when Senator Conway was offering his amendment but I would like to make a couple of comments about that right now. I would support the position that Senator Moore and Senator Lamb are taking on that reverse severability clause because I am under the impression that this is a long-term commitment to do property tax relief, and it seems to me that to upset that balance that all of you have crafted, or if Senator Chambers is right, all of you who have been backed into the corner to craft whatever, that for one segment of the population to end up with benefits and not have those distributed evenly across the board will not move us further down the road which to the goal that I think all of us have, and that is to resolve property taxes as being a tax that we rely too heavily on in this state. So I would be very concerned if there is any real intention here to put the severability clause in, and I would ask the proponents of this bill to think very carefully about that, and one of the cautions that I think you are already aware of, but I would raise again, it seems to me that probably one of the reasons that you had constitutional problems with this bill was our old friend, the 4-R Act, and we are all familiar with that from last year, and the beneficial impact that has had on railroad taxation specifically and personal property taxes, and I can't think of anything that would be more distasteful to most of my constituents to find us ending up in the spot where the railroads got yet another tax break and while homeowners probably, it looks to me like would get tax breaks, nevertheless, that seems to me that would really fly in the face of what I know your good intentions are, and so I would offer that caution as we move along. The other thing that I guess I'd suggest again is we are all on record as saying that once is not enough as far as property tax relief, and this is still a pretty delicately crafted balance, and I would like to give my time to Senator Hall or anyone else who would care to respond, who is one of the sponsors, to once again reiterate for us where do we go from here? What kind of guarantee can we hold out to people? Let's assume that you have got a constitutional bill here, that we don't have to put a severability clause in there, we move down the road, can you paint me a picture what I can tell my constituents about what the next step is and where we might go from here? Senator Hall, would you like my time?

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Hall.