

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President, and members, I rise in opposition to the friendly amendment of Senator Hall. And the reason for doing so is, I think, let's look at what it will do to the amendment. I think Senator Schell...I disagree completely with Senator Schellpeper on what it will do at the polls. You're going to have people, first of all, in the urban areas who are going to look at the LR, right from the outset, at least talking to the people that I've talked to in my district, who are going to say, we don't want a constitutional amendment. We want everything back on the tax rolls. We want a 20 percent decrease in our real estate taxes. That's what the people in that area are going to be doing. Now you add onto that this amendment that says to the rural folk, if you vote against the constitutional amendment, everything is exempt. If you vote for the constitutional amendment, it's going to be taxed on that book value. You take away the incentive to vote for the amendment. Now if that's your agenda, if you're looking for a way to defeat the legislative resolution or defeat the constitutional amendment when it gets on the ballot, this is a great way to do it. And I will give Senator Hall credit, I don't know if he thought of that but I think it's a great way to do it. The...I think we have to look past what we're doing here and I guess that's what I try to keep harping on is that the number of votes we get here is irrelevant if it doesn't get past the voters at the poll. And if we're looking for a short-term fix to get us past the election day in our reelection campaigns, this may be the way to do it. If we're looking for something to avoid having to handle the crisis this year, this may be the way to do it. If we want to...if we want to just postpone it, I think this is the way to do it. What's going to happen though, I think Senator Warner has accurately portrayed the...or painted the scene and that is that we're going to be back here next year with not only 829 but 1063 after the legislative resolution fails at the polls, with 1063 also being declared unconstitutional, with everything back on the tax rolls and with little or no incentive to change it. Remember, once that constitutional amendment fails at the polls, what incentive is there next year to come back and try to change it? I would suggest that if all the personal property is returned to the tax rolls and people in my district and in Senator Hall's district and in Senator Hartnett's district and Senator Withem's district and all the other urban districts...okay, Senator Ashford's district too, and all the other urban districts...Senator Chizek