

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR HALL: Yeah.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Now, with regard to the first part of that, the real property side, as I understand the MAPCO decision, there is no danger now that our ability to tax real property will be stricken by the court. Is that a fair statement?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Beutler, it would appear that with the decision that the court came down with, that what they have done, through the remedy in MAPCO, has not jeopardized the real property tax base, but rather wiped out exemptions to the personal property tax side that loomed out there as a potential problem for the real estate base. That's what it would appear. There are those that testified in front of the committee that they still felt that the real estate base, potentially, was in jeopardy, but I think there were more that felt that MAPCO solidified the real estate base when the court said we are not going to equalize everyone to zero, we are going to rule the exemptions unconstitutional and require those to be repealed.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, that would certainly be my opinion, too. And so I think what we're talking about now doesn't have anything to do with the protection of real estate taxes. What we're talking about now is how we, as a body, should deal with personal property taxes.

SENATOR HALL: Is that a question? Oh.

SENATOR BEUTLER: If...Next question. If we pass this particular amendment, is it not true that with 25 votes, next year in the Legislature, any particular special interest group in this state can get its exemption reinstated.

SENATOR HALL: Senator Beutler, let me read a line for you. Notwithstanding Article III, Section 18 of this Constitution, or any other provision of this Constitution, the Legislature may make rational classifications within the class of tangible personal property and may provide for different methods of valuing such classes, may exempt any such class or classes, and may exempt all personal property from ad valorem taxation. Yes. The answer to your question is, yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: The answer to the question is yes. Is it not