

thumbnail sketch of the situation, the background that has brought us here, the MAPCO decision, and then possible responses, trying to be as neutral as possible in that. And then a very similar explanation of LR 1CA as it's been amended by the committee amendments. With that, here's what the committee amendments would do, it would strike the original version of LR 1CA, all except for the language that would end up on the ballot and the cursory language that was...did not need to be changed that accompanied the constitutional amendment. So it's a total rewrite, if you will. We do that for, I think, one very specific reason. There was much discussion in committee that the part of what the court was telling us in MAPCO, and the part of what we had seen in other decisions as it related to uniformity in taxation with regard to personal or real property was that the court was looking at the uniformity clause as it had been established years ago, in terms of when it was put into the Constitution. The committee felt that it was important to just, in essence, when you're going to go about the process of splitting real and personal property out from the term "tangible" property, which is what 186, LR 1 and other proposals that were introduced would do, that probably the best way to do that, in order to leave no doubt in the court's mind what the intention of the Legislature was, was to basically rewrite Article VIII, Sections 1 and 2 of the Constitution that deal with the taxing authority of the Legislature. And that's what we have done in this amendment. We have gone in and rewritten those two sections. What we have done is we have placed the provision with regard to the real property in Section 1. I think then Section 2 of the Article VIII would deal with personal property. So we have separated them out, dealt with them very differently, so that not only are they hopefully separated with regard to uniformity in any translation that should come down the road, but they're also separated according to how they show up in terms of Article II. One is...deals with real property, Section 2 of Article VIII deals with personal property. So what do we do? We changed the date of the special election from September 10th to September 17th, allows us a little more time. That was a proposal that the administration could live with. Like I said, we strike all of Sections 1 and 2, and create two entirely new sections so that we would have the ability here on the floor to speak, if we so chose, to the reasons for arguments of being able to classify and exempt certain portions of personal property while allowing for uniformity to remain within real property as it currently exists. The...also created in the area of real property three