

PRESIDENT MOUL: If there are no objections, it will be so ordered.

CLERK: Senator, I now have AM3201 as an amendment to Senator Warner's amendment. (The Hall amendment appears on pages 1075-76 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members. Thank you, Mr. Clerk. AM3201 is the amendment that was just passed out in the last 15 minutes while we were under Final Reading. I apologize that it was not printed in the Journal. There were a number of other amendments to the committee amendments that were printed in the Journal. This one was not and I, again, I apologize. I think though that the amendment, if you look at it, is approximately a page and a quarter, is very self-explanatory. And I would think that it would be rather noncontroversial with regard to the amendment itself. It is offered...it's offered for purposes of the problem that could arise if the constitutional amendment should happen to fail at the ballot. There may be those who would like to see the constitutional amendment fail at the ballot. I guess, if that were the case, you probably would not want to vote for this amendment. But it says that if the constitutional amendment...and you can read it right there, doesn't pass, that personal property tax would not be back on the tax rolls. As you all know, under MAPCO, for 1992 personal property is back on the tax rolls. We have an opportunity to make some changes in this session. A constitutional amendment would be necessary to treat personal property different than rural property because of the uniformity clause. That's what the CA is attempting to do. Should that fail, there would...personal property would be back on the tax rolls. Now there would be possibility to come back in a special session. There would be the possibility of a November ballot issue. There would be a lot of possibilities but, I guess, rather than take the chance of those happening, in the future, I would like to, as an amendment to 1063, put in place a provision that says, if the CA fails, personal property does not go back on the tax rolls. There is a number of reasons why. First of all, it only goes back on if the CA fails. If the constitutional amendment fails, personal property will go back on. If we should happen to lose the Jaksha case this year, personal property goes back on. And, thirdly, if the court, in their ruling, says that the application in Jaksha is not only prospective, if they don't limit it only to prospective