

got a problem, and you have got a problem with putting some personal property tax on and other personal property is tax exempt. That is the crux of the problem. That is it. That, in a nutshell, you can't do it. That's what the court said, whether it is a concurring opinion, a majority opinion, or even a minority opinion in those cases that John points out. He is absolutely right, and that is the argument against the 3-R proposal, and you cannot, cannot refute it. If the same thing holds true for this amendment, then it damn well holds true for the 3-R proposal. That is all there is to it, case closed. There is no issue, none whatsoever. And all you are doing is gambling. You are gambling that the court is going to review it in a different light, and I would argue they are not. They are not going to do that. So what's the ultimate solution? You take it all off. You take it all off. You move in that direction and you take all personal property tax off, and you find a replacement source for it. I don't like 1120 the way it sits. I won't support the Moore amendment. I guess I would support it to get it over to Select File, just to get a couple of days hiatus from this debate, but at that point in time, it needs to be adjusted. We need to sit down and talk about how we are going to replace it. But if you make those arguments, and Senator Withem very shrewdly stayed away from those arguments, he talked procedure when he talked about this issue, you make those arguments that John just made and they are very accurate arguments, they hold true in form and in substance to the 3-R proposal. It isn't going to happen. It isn't going to happen with this court if they are consistent in their opinions down the line. And the question is going to be asked, the question is going to be asked on property that is subject to the depreciation proposal, the net book value, if you will, in 3-R, and those that are not subject to it. And that federal issue of the 4-R Act and how it is applied in terms of discriminatory treatment with regard to railroad property is going to be asked to that same district court, and you are going to get the same answer. I agree. Couldn't agree more. I would still urge adoption of the amendment to the amendment because I guess, if I am willing to gamble, I am willing to gamble on this approach as opposed to, you know, a new revised version of this approach, which is really all the 3-R approach is. It is the old system revised. Somehow we are going to magically make it good by a constitutional amendment that proponents of the measure just said won't work as it relates to the old system. You can't have it both ways. Push comes to shove, you have to, since you won't vote on the first amendment I offered to the committee