

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schmit. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Very briefly, Madam President. I look at the amendment that we adopted that was the 30 vote level, and I hope you will have a chance to look at it more carefully because, when we talked about it, we talked about 30 votes in order to provide an exemption or 30 votes to remove an exemption, but this talks about any classification or change or repeal of classification. It, basically, anything we do in the area will require 30 votes. So Senator Lamb has talked about empowering the Legislature, but it looks to me like for anything we want to do will take 30 votes to utilize that power that we give ourselves. And, again, my concern has been...I support, generally, the concept of moving forward with this constitutional amendment, but the step taken of requiring 30 votes in this broad fashion, I am not sure is really, again, in the best interest of us down the road, and we are dealing here, again, with the Constitution, the fundamental policy, fundamental structure of our government, and we have got to be careful about what we are doing. I think Senator Schmit is saying that, others are saying that. Every word, every period, every comma is absolutely essential to whether or not we achieve whatever goals we have. And so, I am assuming this will advance despite my and others opposition, but, hopefully, we will carefully read it because we can still amend it again. We aren't on a constitutional amendment limited as we would with a bill, and if you are still inclined to support it, please look at it carefully because I think it does something maybe different than you thought it did, and that we have to be very careful with the language.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Madam President and members. You know over the years I wonder if there has been anybody in this body that has been more opposed to property tax than I have. I really don't think so. I have not liked property tax. I don't think they are fair. I don't think they are equitable. There are many other types of taxes I think that are more fair. So, why am I opposing this now? See, for the reduction in property taxes, I see LR 1 in its present form as being a lose, lose, lose situation from my agenda which involves reducing property taxes. It is a lose, lose situation. First of all, if the constitutional amendment fails in the election, which will only