

of the proposal as it was introduced by the Governor. The amendments that we offered are found in front of the...they're the white copy of LR 186. It's very short. There are really only...there is one section where there is substantive language stricken. There is a couple other lines throughout and then there is really only three different spots where there is language that is highlighted, in other words, language that is added. It's a very short read. I would urge members to take the time to just walk through that if they would. The issue, as it was introduced by the Governor, dealt with the provision in the Constitution that deals with uniformity, uniformity as it relates to tangible, personal tangible property as read in the Constitution. What the Governor's proposal would do and what committee amendments would do would basically break out real property and personal property as they relate to uniformity and only have uniformity as it is in the Constitution, modify real property. In other words, it would apply to real property. Personal property would then be able to be classified, exempted, treated differently and taxed in whatever way the Legislature saw fit. In other words, the intent of the constitutional amendment is to allow the Legislature to continue to operate in the manner that we felt we had the ability to do, that we had done in the past, and function in that same manner, but function in it constitutionally. The change that we did make that did move some things around is that we did move the motor vehicle exception to the end of the section so that it would be along the specific provisions as they relate to livestock. We also took the issue as it relates to tangible personal property and made that classification exempted by the Constitution or legislation in part or entirely. In other words, we made the specific notation that we can treat personal property in any way the Legislature sees fit, the issue of items that are exempt within the Constitution as the Legislature may do statutorily. The issue as it relates to exempting property only by the Constitution was stricken and then probably the last issue that is different from what the...well, the only thing that is really different other than the intent of what the Governor offered is the first underscored line that you see on the first page of the committee amendments and that's where we take and insert the language "except as provided in this article, taxes", and that is underscored as new language. The purpose behind that is to make sure that, frankly, that the amendment, as it deals with ag land, is virtually foolproof. It is, I think, then able to withstand any attack as it relates to a separate classification and the uniformity as we split it out from tangible and have it