

you're next.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, as we discuss these issues, there's a lot of things said that I'm sure is going to create misunderstanding because in my opinion, at least, they just simply aren't true. There is a reference made consistently that 1063 puts everything back on, at least business equipment, livestock, farm equipment and inventory. I don't know how many times one has to say this but there isn't a soul in this body who doesn't know that it's on now. It's been on since January 1, 1992 by order of the courts and there isn't a soul in this body who shouldn't know that it's on at market value. And to consistently come up and make the comment that 1063 somehow or other puts these items on the tax rolls is just total misrepresentation of what the situation is because we know by the virtue of the Supreme Court as of last July it is on at that basis now. Now the next argument, to argue that the CA creates a...wipes out the uniformity clause, it does not touch the uniformity clause and proportionate clause when it comes to valuation of personal property. What the change is on depreciable property is that there is a single method of depreciation that is required, a single method. I don't know how much more uniformity you can ask for than one method. That is uniform. If there were two methods permitted, then it would not be uniform. One method is the same as uniform treatment under that system and that is what the proposed amendment says and it's very annoying to consistently have people say the repeal of the uniformity clause is in the constitutional amendment when it simply is not true when there is a single method used. And, finally, we keep arguing or keep bringing back that we should exempt all and perhaps so, but I am one of those who do not believe that the current Constitution will permit it and we had runs at the constitutional amendment the other day trying to strike out special legislation as one of the exemptions or exceptions, rather, that is contained in that constitutional amendment. The simple facts are that under existing Constitution the basis for the throwing out exemptions has been by and large tied into the prohibition of special legislation and, as a result of that, personal property has been put on the tax rolls since January by the court. Saying something isn't so doesn't make it so and to say that you can exempt property currently in the face of all the Supreme Court decisions, in my opinion, simply is not an accurate reflection of what it is. The amendment, as I understand it, deals with 775. Well I, too, did not vote for 775, but it is there and it