

that?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Senator Lynch, I was prepared to talk to you about the first and I didn't catch your second part, I am sorry.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Lynch, go ahead.

SENATOR LYNCH: Since I don't have that other copy, the first change...well, this copy keeps "unless" and does not put in "not." I will have to get...

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Senator Lynch, I will just come walk down and go through it.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Lynch. Senator Warner, did you wish to speak again? Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I guess I have some of the same questions and concerns that were expressed by Senator Scott Moore, and, Senator Warner, woul' you yield to a question, if you would, please? Is this language on page 2, strikes so-and-so and so-and-so, shall be taxed at depreciated cost, and then or shall be taxed by valuation uniformly and proportionately, is that included in there in the event that the court might say that the depreciated cost is not a method whereby you can tax personal property, is that what it is there for?

SENATOR WARNER: No. It is...Senator Schmit, what it is in there for, as I indicated, which was to narrow the options where a number of comments have been made that there was too much flexibility. This is to restrict the number of options that the Legislature has to avoid the issue of too much flexibility that's raised from time to time, restricts us to three ways of considering.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, I really don't know what to say because, very honestly, I have consistently said if we are going to take away the uniformity, then we just as ought to it away and let the people know exactly where we are at. That means that the less Legislature can do anything they can get 25 votes for, or whatever it takes. I am concerned, I suppose, because I've just seen this now, and I apologize for not having read it earlier, that I may not understand it. I guess that I can only hope that