

the date, so that that language is not included. It makes it just the language that ties in the special legislation clause of the Constitution. With that, I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. I will now recognize Senator Hall, followed by Senators Morrissey, Schmit, Kristensen, Warner, and Wehrbein. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise to support Senator Lindsay's amendment, although I don't think it is the protection that needs to be in the bill. I mean what the purpose behind it is to, I guess, put the tourniquet on after all the blood has run out of the body, in terms of personal property. It says that down the road any future exemptions, should there be anything to grant, is going to be...have to be done on an equal basis. Now I guess it is the kind of an amendment that probably sounds good, but I just don't know what effect it has in relation to the proposals that are before us now. I mean it is a...I think it does bring something to the constitutional amendment, but it does not, by any stretch of the imagination, override notwithstanding provisions as they relate to the other types of things that we strike as it relates to personal property, that being the special legislation, the ex post facto, the bills of attainder, the other uniform and protective types of clauses and articles to our Constitution as they relate to other forms of property tax and other issues, but in this case, under the constitutional amendment as it is drafted, not only do we strike out the specific articles that I mentioned, but we also throw in a catch-all phrase that says, any other provisions of this Constitution to the contrary. That is a wonderful piece of I guess work of art with regard to what this proposal is all about. It says if we didn't get everything, any other interpretation, there is no other way to determine I guess except for what the judges may feel might conflict with that. We say that if there is anything else in here that we might have missed, or that you might interpret differently, or might down the road, subsequently be interpreted, that doesn't apply either. It is kind of the catch-all phrase for constitutional amendments as they apply to personal property, and although that is not what Senator Lindsay's amendment is, at least I think John is being honest in saying that for purposes of down the road, it may help the issue of further erosion. I guess I would argue that there is very little further to erode with regard to the issue of personal