

the future, to totally do away with personal property tax. Is that a fair interpretation of what your replacement language...I am not saying it mandates that you do that but allows you the flexibility to do so?

SENATOR HALL: As does the current language in the committee amendments.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, but I want to make sure in the change that that is still a...

SENATOR HALL: That there is...I believe that there is no substantive effect to the committee amendments, that the change and the intent are the same. It is a semantics as far as I am concerned. That is why I don't have any problem with the change.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, and with that comment, I have no problem with that, too, would also rise to support the amendment, and I think that that goes a long ways today towards calming any fears that we may have had over some of the language, at least at this point until we have a chance to maybe look it over. But I think the body should feel comfortable in adopting something like this, and if there are other changes, we have other stages of debate, and with that, I'd certainly support and thank Senator Hall for this amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Wickersham, did you wish to address this amendment?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also wish to rise and say that I support the amendments, and thank Senator Hall for bringing them to us. I believe that they do clarify certain language that I was concerned about, and I believe that we are moving in the direction that is necessary, and that is to place within the hands of this body the flexibility to determine future tax policy for this state.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Anyone else wishing to discuss the amendment offered by Senator Hall? Seeing none, Senator Hall, do you wish to close?

SENATOR HALL: Only in that I hope this is seen as a sign of my willingness to cooperate with the administration, and would urge adoption of the amendment to the amendment.