

important and it's going to affect immediately the debate on this bill and the debate on the constitutional amendment. This amendment has a very bad flaw in it. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Withem, you're next.

SENATOR WITHEM: Mr. Speaker, members, one more time I rise against the...this particular amendment, respond to two or three things that have been said. First of all, Senator Beutler, I very much appreciate pointing out the language here. And I really don't know if that is just a...the language did not get amended to reflect the intent of what Senator Hall means, or if that is his intent. And I would hope in his closing remarks he would address Senator Beutler's point as to whether the intent is to indicate that if a constitutional amendment is placed on the ballot, and if it is defeated, this measure is triggered, or if it is...if we don't even place the constitutional amendment on the ballot at all, is this particular amendment triggered. The way it is now written the latter would be the case. We would not have to refer a constitutional amendment on to the voters. The passage of 1063 and the failure to refer an amendment would cause all personal property to not be taxed. Second point I'd like to make is Senator Hall made some reference to use the term schizophrenia regarding those of us who were talking economic development business arguments on 1120, and are talking homeowner residential arguments here. I plead guilty, plead guilty on that very point. It's something that in my personal reflections on this measure I debate, if not on an hourly basis, at least a daily basis. And failure to pass anything in the short-term would be better beneficial to residential property taxpayers. If that were the only constituency I was concerned about I would probably say let's not pass 1063, let's not pass anything, let's allow the current law to continue in effect. We don't represent just one constituency, we represent others. And I think in the long run that policy is not in the best interest of the state as compared with the policy in 1063. I reiterate, though, that moving much further along the spectrum toward more favorable treatment of personal property than 1063 has taken us, or to shift the tax burden that comes as a result of passage of 1063 on some groups offer those groups, by virtue of other tax measures, passes beyond that line beyond which I don't feel I can further go. So I...I...he's correct in pointing out that there is kind of a schizoid reaction here on some of us, and I plead guilty to that