

uniform clause. Just like the Constitution of the United States, there's been many attempts to try to change it back in Washington, but it's a pretty sacred document. And it usually was established by people a lot smarter than we were, people that had nothing to gain and nothing to lose but tried to develop language that protected us all against ourselves and, in most cases, everybody against policymakers who might try to violate that trust. As far as depreciation is concerned, why real property certainly can depreciate. If you have an apartment complex, for example, you depreciate that complex. Certainly it's there and you can see it, but it's no different from personal property, that apartment house, it's a piece of real property that can be abused, can be burned down. If you served on a Board of Equalization, like I did, for over 20 years, you can even understand where some real estate property, known as real property, can, in fact, have a negative value. It would profit you to tear it down and get rid of it because, because it's there, you have to pay a tax on it. So let's not confuse any of these arguments about taxes and the difference between personal and real property simply because something might move around and might be depreciated, because real property certainly does that too. The spirit of the law has also been mentioned and I've seen some spirits move some people around here that wasn't in the best interest of anybody. I don't think assuming that just because some language might exist in a constitutional amendment that assumes the spirit of the law will be followed when, in fact, we admit we don't want to follow the spirit of the Constitution and the uniformity clause. I've got to throw this in as far as classes are concerned, I don't think we really seriously treated...we can consider the people represented by legislators in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Congressional Districts equally as a class, did we? How can we trust the same kind of people to develop a fair and uniform tax policy as well? The uniform clause is about the only protection people have. And God bless the courts, as far as I'm concerned, for stepping in when we go too far, and make sure that those people are protected. I think we ought to tread very lightly when we play games with language or any other thing, maybe no games, but, nevertheless, in a sense we try to develop language that pro...that provides for those of us who want to make policy and protect, in some cases, or even create in others tax policy that really is not uniform and in some cases even fair. I don't know how far we go back to be fair but, in any case, I was sitting here thinking, it has never been discussed, that probably the ideal thing would be for us to go