

flexibility we need to overall examine tax policy,...

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Time.

SENATOR WESELY: ...year in and year out into the future. And so, again, on this amendment it's a step forward, but it is not, in my view, the compromise I had hoped for.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Next speaker is Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. I guess I need to ask someone a question here first. Senator Hall, would you respond?

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Senator Hall.

SENATOR LAMB: It's my understanding then that we would start out with no exemptions, and it would take 30 votes to reinstate the exemptions, any of them that we made. Is that correct?

SENATOR HALL: Well I think that because of the previous amendment on the other bill that probably the only exemptions would be in place for personal property would be for 775 personal property and earthmoving equipment.

SENATOR LAMB: So, you know, okay, then the big four are going to be...When we start this process, then those four that the Supreme Court enumerated would be off, they would be repealed, and then it would take 30 votes to reinstate any of those four.

SENATOR HALL: That's my understanding.

SENATOR LAMB: Okay, thank you. Okay, that's what gives me a problem, or that's one thing that gives me a problem. And Senator Wesely alluded to the fact that powerful interests will be in here looking for exemptions. And, unfortunately, those powerful interests in this state do not, at this point, include agriculture. So what I see happening here is that there will be 30 votes here on the floor to exempt business inventories, for example, but there will never be 30 votes here to exempt the farm machinery, livestock. So by voting for this, I think we're putting farm equipment back on the rolls, we're taking inventories off, in effect that's what will happen. And I see no way that I can support that, because I don't think it's fair and equitable, and it's letting the powerful interests come in