

flexibility for determining what all these things are that we're going to do. This amendment is part of that modern reflection. And that modern reflection is that we're going to take personal property and we can do one of two things, we can either take it all off, or we can put it all on. And if you go row by row here, on the floor of the Legislature, and ask everybody, you want to put all the property on, or you want to take it all off, everybody has an opinion as to whether they should do that. And there are some reasonable exemptions for the people that want to put it all on, they might say, well, there's a couple I'd kind of like to do. This allows you the option to do that. It's the intent, or at least I would think my intent to support this is for the reason that we're going to add uniformity and make sure that it's there with real property, and that would be uniformity within the classes of real property that we've established. Now the personal property is, we have problems with definitions of personal property. But the other thing you want the Legislature to be able to do is for good reasons, be they economics, to encourage, let's say you want to encourage a project or an industry, that you can have reasons for not allowing taxation for that personal property as a reflection that we think agriculture, for example, is an important industry. We may think ethanol is an important industry, we may think that business is an important industry, we may think that homeowners are, with certain personal property, that we don't want to have the headaches of trying to collect, well, let's say, household goods. So what this constitutional amendment would allow us to do is on the personal property end, the maximum flexibility of making definitions in reasonable classifications. Does this mean that we're going to solve all our problems with the constitutional amendment? Absolutely not. There is still a danger, and the danger is real that our Supreme Court is going to look at this and say, you can't make those distinctions, you still have some fundamental fairness that you...and as Senator Landis pointed out, that you've got real property paying the entire bill. Let's say you exempt off all personal property, the homeowner is going to come in and bring that suit and say this isn't fair. What you want to be able to do is to...for that homeowner's suit, that's already filed, and I don't think that that filing is probably a correct one, I don't think it came at the right time, I think it came for other reasons, but, at this point, I don't think it's going to be successful either, but I don't think that you can take the risk. And I think that's what some members in here were insinuating, is that it isn't worth the risk, and thus you need the constitutional