

will. I would agree with something Senator Lamb said, that we must find some permanent solution, but I think we can do it very quickly. I would support putting everything back on the tax rolls, with the exception of intangibles, household goods, and inventory. In all three of those categories, we can find legal grounds for doing that. That's the easy way to do this. And then, if all the special interests that everybody seems to be referring to want to exempt out some ag land things, whatever it might be, or some railroad things, or some pipeline things, or some inventory things, or other kinds of things, that's easy to do, because then they would have to stand on their own and it would have to fly in the face of equity and either survive or not. We would, by doing this, create, I think, a pool of money that would far exceed the \$1.2 billion we need to offset what local jurisdictions need to meet their obligations. Caps would probably be necessary only because there would be more potential for income there than is needed. But if you would be paying no tax at all, if you...say you have 100 percent of value and, in fact, paying tax on that, you could probably be paying 70, 60 percent of what you were paying on that property or personal property. If you're paying no tax, you would pay 60 or 70 percent. If you're a farmer, you'd be paying 60 or 70 percent, and that seems to me, if I can count right, better than 80 percent, like we're talking about in whatever it is, 320 or 830. But it seems to me that what we're doing now is a very difficult thing, it's a complicated thing. Sometimes I might even think it's intended to be that way to keep us from doing the right thing. Some of us are involved with a lawsuit because, just as Senator Lamb pointed out, we don't want some people to get stuck temporarily or permanently with their unfair share or burden. Ladies and gentlemen, I think we're just trying to do this the hard way. We probably intentionally, in some cases, are doing it that way on purpose. But I'd suggest the simple way is the best, and will offer that opportunity at a later time on the debate on this bill. And, for what it's worth, I would oppose, because of that, the Lamb amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Lynch. I don't see Senator Schmit or Senator Moore yet. We will go to Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Question.

SPEAKER BAACK: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. We will now vote on ceasing debate. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Senator Wehrbein.