

if it goes on the ballot that the taxpayer will read it thoroughly, digest it, analyze it, and know what he is doing, or he or she is doing before she gets to the ballot box because I have a sick feeling in the bottom of my stomach that it doesn't do what I want it to do. And when you say it restricts, my concern is that it will limit the Legislature in the future from the standpoint of opening up the property tax exemptions, and I guess I am concerned about it. I am going to have to read it over again, and again, and again, and hopefully I will understand it better, but, in all honesty, I am not too optimistic. I hope someone can explain it better than I understand it at the present time.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Schmit. Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I would like Senator Warner to answer a question for me, if he would, please.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Warner, would you respond, please.

SENATOR WARNER: If I can.

SENATOR DIERKS: Senator Warner, on your amendment, 3187, on line 3 where it says "by this Constitution or by legislation," I am wondering what the need is for "by legislation" in there?

SENATOR WARNER: Oh, because that is so that we could have an exemption by legislation. You have a number of things...that makes sure where it is permissive to have exemption in the Constitution, that it can be done by legislation. Household goods, for example, is per...well, everything is permissive virtually except governmental property, and this is to retain that provision of by legislation to reflect where it is currently permissive and has not been thrown out by the courts.

SENATOR DIERKS: I guess that I thought that the reason for the CA was to remove that permissiveness.

SENATOR WARNER: No, the reason for the CA is to separate the requirement...well, there is several reasons, but the first one is to separate the uniformity clause between real and personal property.

SENATOR DIERKS: Well I understand that, but I thought this was