

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam President, fellow senators. I don't know what else can be added to the dialogue that has been had but I do want to reaffirm that I think that...that the symbolism that Senator Wickersham spoke of...spoke of is real. I think that those that have any inclination to provide any measure of security to especially the less populated areas that are going to be hit hard by our tax package. And there are some that will be hit hard, ought to stick behind this amendment. This amendment does have the flexibility of saying that the property shall not be valued above 80 percent or above 100 percent. It doesn't mean it can't be valued less, but it will be more difficult. In case someone would have an idea of doing it significantly different, we do have this measure of security in the constitution, and I am sure Senator Chambers would say, normally, that he is against putting specifics in the constitution, and I generally am too. But this does still allow a measure of flexibility by saying the value shall not exceed 80 percent, shall not exceed 100 percent. For those that say that this blows the tax package apart, I...I have to really...I have to really question why they are so disturbed by this action. It doesn't change the law the way it exists right now; the 80-20 or 80-100 relationship is already there. It doesn't change that. What I've seen in the last 80 days or so, or 80 some days, 60 days probably is that we have declined to recognize wealth as a factor in the school aid formula. We are moving towards passing a package in the school finance area that is going to ultimately result in more emphasis being placed on the value of property behind each student again, and I am seeing resistance from some of the same senators who support those packages from placing this measure of security, be that as it may, a little bit of security in the constitution. That leads me to believe that this entire property tax package may...may result in some more permanent shifting than I had hoped, and I hope...I hope that I am wrong, but I am fearful of that, I really am. I think that to adopt the Schrock amendment is simply granting an olive branch or a small measure of security to those entities that we are asking to buy into the package, and there has been...there has been many good comments, and perhaps we will benefit from those comments eventually in some way. But I sure hope that those of us who I think should be behind this amendment will certainly stick with it and let's move on from here. Thank you, Madam President.