

unfair in my opinion and especially to a person like me who does not believe that personal property is the best way to raise money for governmental purposes. Here we'll have a situation where it only takes, as I understand the amendment, 25 votes to put it back on, but takes...or to take it off then it takes 30 votes to remove it from the tax rolls. So you'd have the situation where with 25 votes you could put the items back on the tax rolls and it takes 30 to take them off. Intrinsicly, that, to me is unfair. So I would oppose this amendment.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Thank you, Senator Lamb. Senator Warner.

**SENATOR WARNER:** Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I've been thinking about the proposal, too, as it has been discussed and there's just a couple of concerns that come to my mind. The other night when we were discussing it, and again as I recall, Senator Kristensen talked about the probability and a possibility of coalitions making the whole concept of review every 10 years unlikely to be successful and my first reaction is that it would tend to probably be with a higher vote requirement even a greater probability of coalitions at those times when reviews are being made and I'm not sure that is beneficial. But more importantly, I envision what is going to happen when we come back in, in the event this constitutional amendment is enacted, is that we're going to see the utilization of the wording in this Constitution exactly what it is and that personal property tax, it's permissive, be exempt, that is it could be taxed by valuation in part or in whole or otherwise and I would suspect that what you're going to see as exemptions are expanded, should they be, that the method of replacing the revenue is going to be a part of the same bill and to make an exemption and raise revenue from the source that you're exempting which is the way it should be, may be even more difficult to do with 30 votes. It may need to be 25 in order to avoid some unhealthy coalitions that might otherwise be dealt, but then finally I would say that there is one 30 vote protection that is in the Constitution which of course that we'll address with the Governor and if a Governor should veto then you're still going to be facing that 30 votes and I think that is a protection that is one that can serve the public well too and may well not need this 30 vote protection along with that one in addition.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Schellpeper.