

that the proponents of LR 219 would like to see. But it also doesn't bring with it the kinds of, I guess, attractions of come sue me that the current version of the proposal would do. It's guaranteed that that is going to happen under the provision under 219 as it exists. And it will come in a couple different forms. It doesn't mean to say that under this version that could not happen. It will be much more difficult to make that case. It is an argument on which you say we're going to have uniform proportionality as it relates to real property, on the personal property tax side, we don't address that. The Legislature has the power to deal with that in a separate manner. And uniform proportionality doesn't apply, in this case, to personal property. It separates it out, it makes it clean, it leaves it fairly understandable for the voters to take a look at just what's being done. And the other language that's stripped out of there, dealing with motor vehicles,...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...is a technical change that the bill drafters did to just slide some language over. If you look from one page to the next, you'll find that a rewrite of it it shows up in a different section. There are no substantive changes to what the Constitution says in that area, it just makes a shift in where it currently sits. The change is that one word where you strike tangible, you insert real, and where you go and add inventory as a potential exemption under the Constitution. I would urge adoption of the amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Warner.

SENATOR W'RNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose the amendment for a number of reasons. It's true that this approach, if we go back to last year, was one that we talked about, and it's true that it's the concept that could be enacted. Fortunately, it has a number of problems with it. The comment was made this is simple and plain, I believe I heard, very few words. The big difference is, yes, that's true, and that means the court has a wide range of interpretations that they can make. The court will have a wide range of interpretations. As 219A (sic) is written, it is written to anticipate many of the provisions that have been in prior court cases where in some cases special legislation was brought in as a fact, not addressed if you do it as proposed here, others as well. And you're going to not accomplish what you thought, what