

won't be here so we don't care, in all those other urban districts once they experience a 20 percent decrease in real estate taxes, how are we going to come in here and vote to increase those taxes again? How are urban people going to try to help out? We can't do it. We won't be able to do it. And you're putting us in a position of having to go back and run in reelection campaigns and taking back that huge decrease in property taxes, not a real tough position to put us in, we can appreciate that. But you're putting us in a real tough position next year, we won't be able to do it. People in our districts won't stand for us increasing the taxes dramatically. And I think that's what we're doing here. We're trying to defeat the legislative resolution, and if that's what we want, that's fine, but let's be clear about what we're doing. I oppose the Hall amendment and I would urge the rest of you to do so also.

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

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Madam President, and members of the body, I think Senator Lindsay started us talking about something that maybe those of us who represent districts that are primarily residential real estate haven't really talked about. There appears to be this assumption that there is a...a general consensus that the worst possible thing that could happen would be to have MAPCO continue to be implemented and follow down that road, and that everybody in here will be scrambling to prevent that from happening. And it's true, we have been. Those of us from the urban areas that think it would be detrimental to tax farm inventories and business inventories have been striving ever since the special session to find that middle ground. And, again, I reference Senator Beutler's amendment during the special session that would have done that. The fact that we are striving to do something other than have everything taxed has been misinterpreted. It's been misinterpreted that we will do anything we can do to keep everything from going on the tax rolls. That is not true. That is most certainly not true. There are many things that would happen that would cause us to accept everything going back onto the tax rolls. And, frankly, this amendment is one of them. This amendment that will continue an exemption of all personal property, particularly this one the way it's drafted right now, is a \$100 million increase on real estate property, is far worse to the state, far worse to my constituents and I would guess if you looked at your districts, it would be far worse to a majority of your voters than having everything on the tax rolls. And that's where we