

revenues so that we can continue to exist and provide essential services because the Legislature will not turn their backs on you, and I will not turn my back on you. As I listen to this discussion, I am beginning to ask myself whether I can continue to trust myself and all of us in this body, what is the problem? Someone has got to explain the problem with putting in a more permanent position what has been a policy of this body. If people's pride is hurt, that I don't buy because we all get our pride hurt almost every day in here. That's...that you can't be in here and be an extremely prideful person and not have it stepped on once in awhile. That's not the point. I do appreciate everything the Revenue Committee has done and is doing, and that's not the point, I don't believe. Is there...is there a reason why we can't have this in the constitution, that is it going to foul up further shifts of revenue from those communities that are going to be struggling, in my district, anyway? Somebody has to answer the question. I have been trying to listen. Maybe I've missed it, but all I am hearing is this is going to foul up the package. People aren't going to vote for it, but nobody is really telling me exactly why, exactly what the problem is. It isn't giving anyone an advantage that they don't already have. Homeowners are already supposed to be at 100 percent. Farmland is already supposed to be at 80 percent. It doesn't shift the burden. It doesn't shift the advantage. Simply places it in the constitution, which is where we are putting some of the other provisions in 292. So I'm really struggling with this, not with what I am going to do. I am going to support Senator Schrock's amendment, but it makes me wonder what...what is there here that we don't understand, or what is the plan that isn't yet before us, and how does this foul up that plan? Why do we need the...

SENATOR WILL: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...flexibility in the assessment of property. If we are going to make a major change someday in the assessment of property, I would assume that it would be appropriate to do that by constitutional method anyway, perhaps. So someone is going to have to convince me that there is a problem here. Otherwise, I...I am becoming quite concerned about where we are heading. I urge the body not to reconsider the Schrock amendment.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Warner.