

March 5, 1992

LR 219

SENATOR WARNER: Then it allows a depreciation method or a different system of valuation that is uniform and proportionate. You have the possibility of exemption because that is already in there.

SENATOR MOORE: But my question is, but the uniformity does not apply to, I don't know if it is the second option, the depreciable option, uniformity does not apply there, correct? Does not have to apply there.

SENATOR WARNER: It...you would have the broad necessity of a class, that you would not be able to treat a class disproportionately, but you could classify in a depreciable...

SENATOR MOORE: Classify, okay, but you would be opposed to changing that "or" to "and"?

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR MOORE: Okay.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Lynch, you are next.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. Speaker and members, anybody can answer this question for me I guess. I guess the handout of the amendment indicates on lines, on page 2, beginning on line 1, through "direct", are the numbers right? It looks to me like it would be on line 9 through "direct" in line 12 rather than line 4. And I...I know that. Well, it's because I have a copy of the bill here. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Apparently I didn't have what some other people had around here. All right. And then my only other question would be, can somebody help me understand why "unless" was taken out and "not" put in, and so what is the difference between "not" and "unless,"? If somebody can explain that to me I would...

SPEAKER BAACK: Are you asking Senator Warner?

SENATOR LYNCH: Anybody, I don't know, anybody that wrote this.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Kristensen, are you going to answer