

amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Will, you're next.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I rise in support of the Hall amendment as well. I think what we're looking at with respect to the Hall amendment versus the language that's in LR 219 right now is essentially a choice between a bill that was drafted specifically to address a number of court decisions and to find a way around those decisions versus a bill that Senator Hall would suggest, that is a statement of general principle as to some fundamental changes that we want to make in the Constitution. I think certainly you can make a good argument that it's necessary to draft a constitutional amendment to specifically address court decisions. But the fact of the matter is, I think, that no matter what you do in a constitutional amendment, we know that the Supreme Court has the final word. And it's been demonstrated to the Legislature, several times over the last decade, that regardless of the changes that the Legislature suggests with respect to taxation of agricultural land, for example, the Supreme Court has seen fit to come back and say that we have not made a sufficient exception to the uniformity clause. I don't know that we can do that by carving out exceptions to things like...like special legislation in the Constitution. I don't know if that takes us down that road. I think we're running a risk there of opening up some other problems with our property tax system. I think that the Hall amendment is perhaps a little open-ended when it comes to personal property, when it essentially, simply removes it from the uniformity clause and doesn't address it otherwise. I think Senator Kristensen has addressed that point. And I guess as I re...Senator Hall, would you respond to a question?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Hall, would you respond, please?

SENATOR HALL: Yes.

SENATOR WILL: Senator Hall, last night we talked about an amendment to one of the amendments that was eventually adopted to the bill that dealt with the ways that the LR 219, as currently drafted, would allow personal property to be taxed. I believe you had an amendment at that point that required uniformity within the class of personal property, I think with respect to the depreciation method of valuing property. Is that