

here and do things that those of us that do not represent powerful interests will not be able to do. So it's downhill for agriculture, if this is adopted, in my opinion. And I just don't see how I can support it, or support the constitutional amendment, if this amendment is adopted.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you, Senator Lamb. Our next speaker is Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, members. I rise in opposition to the amendment. Again, just on a philosophical basis. I don't believe that...I believe that there is a sincere and honest attempt on the part of the introducers and those who are working toward this end to bring this session to some kind of resolution, which I appreciate, I understand that and find great merit in that. It's the proposal itself that I do not agree with. I prefer to deal with the issue as it relates to all forms of taxation, and would argue that whether it takes 30 or 40 votes, or whether it takes 2 votes, that whatever you put in place and whatever you shift, you are going to affect the other forms of taxation, and you are going to affect different people in terms of their burden as it relates to taxation, and that, until we look at it from the overall tax scheme, we are going to continue to do that. Now that's a very purist attitude and outlook on this, but that's the one I have. We have...I think we find ourselves in the position we are because we have refused to recognize that over the years. We have continued to, as others would argue, let the special interests dictate what happens in here. I don't necessarily buy that, because I don't believe that the all on or all off approach, with regard to personal property, is the right way to go either. It is...There are other alternatives that can be looked at, but they cannot be looked at until you know what the impact will be, and where you're going to replace that revenue, how you're going to guarantee that it doesn't fall on the homeowner. So when you take personal property and remove it from the tax rolls, and you shift it to real estate, you can't argue that it doesn't go on the small farmer, the rural homeowner, the urban homeowner, those are the people that you have to worry about when you make these kinds of changes. And, granted, we want to retain the status quo, and that's one of the reasons that I think we've been in called into session. That, I guess, is laudable if you don't want to stir the waters to any great extent. I, frankly, want to stir the waters. I don't think our tax system is one to be very proud of. Testimony in the Revenue Committee by someone