

temporary problem as opposed to the long-term consistency of the 3-R Committee. Secondly, as a matter of fact, in private conversation I think Senator Lindsay will tell you he doesn't think that there is a property tax crisis at this point. I think that's a fair characterization and then basically it would be acceptable if 829 did not pass for the reason that it would force a real constitutional controversy. I don't think that I want to wait for that day to come. Unlike Senator Lindsay, I want 829 to pass. I want us to have a solution. I want us to fill the one-year gap and I don't want the Supreme Court to throw us into a property tax cataclysm by declaring our real estate taxes at risk or all our tax system at risk. I don't have a law case in front of the Supreme Court basically arguing that that's what should happen. I want to solve this problem, policy now as opposed to delaying. Senator Lindsay's arguments are not only, I think they have their own merit, but remember that this serves the interests of that point of view that says don't pass 829. How many of you don't want to pass 829? How many don't want to have a one-year property tax solution in place and then start the 3-R process because that's what 829 does. Now on this basic difference, Senator Lindsay and I disagree. There are probably language and equity amendments that should be involved here. If we had started from day one, we probably could have worked on them. Maybe we can work on them yet, but we need to fashion a remedy and this is a reasonable one. It points the way towards a reasonable place. It does not have a \$120 million across-the-board service tax price tag, it's true. It is meant as a stopgap, but it seems to me that it is stopping some exemptions which is something that we regularly say we should do. It is progressive in nature. For those of us who want to pass 829, unlike Senator Lindsay, this I think offers us that opportunity and basically sets a good formal policy for us to pursue. Having carried my message and told you what I promised the Governor I would tell you, I still intend to vote for this amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Madam Chair and members, I rise again, I rise again to oppose this amendment. You know this is one, this is one that should...if we were going to consider this, I think we should have done it previously. We should have had a public hearing. I mean, this is different than adding on an additional rate to an existing tax. This is a whole new ball game. I feel strongly about this. I think that this is a