

obviously, is to implement the MAPCO decision in the event that we, for any reason at all, do not amend the Constitution, to change the outcome of that decision, and as I outlined yesterday in some brief remarks that I will try and make just as brief today, I think it is the responsible thing for the Legislature to do, to pass a bill such as this that gives the Department of Revenue and the local county assessors direction as to if this property does, indeed, have to be returned to the tax rolls, how it is to be done, how assessments are made, how values are distributed, such as the centrally assessed values that Senator Haberman's last question referred to. It simply clears up a lot of ambiguities. I know the argument is out there that the counties have the authority right now to go out and assess this property if the court should deem that to be the way that we go, and that the Legislature doesn't do anything about it, or the people don't do anything about it in a vote on the constitutional amendment, but the fact of the matter is that I am sure that assessment practices and the like would vary so much from county to county, the speed with which this would be implemented would vary so much that passing state legislation is the responsible thing to do. I would urge you to vote to reconsider this amendment, to adopt the amendment, and then to advance the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I'd rise also to support the reconsideration because it is necessary to make a workable bill that can be discussed. I just want to make a couple of comments, though, that along with what Senator Schmit pointed out, the dilemma the state is headed for, regardless, if personal property is put back on the tax rolls as an ad valorem tax. That was, in fact, the whole issue, and the whole issue, as I have said time and time again, for a hundred years, was an issue of valuation. That was always the problem because you cannot equitably tax personal property. There is just not a way. There never has been. And the concept was never in the sixties, and in the things that I was involved with, that we were exempting it from taxation. We were looking for another way to tax personal property, and once that we had a sales and an income tax, then it became a feasible way that you had a way to tax personal property, both tangibles and intangibles other than an ad valorem, which on an administrative basis was a nightmare and constant inequities, no matter what was done. That will continue on. It is not in this bill,