

1/3 of the area would be so treated. It should be noted that this proposed legislation is open to the same objection of continuing inequality among the various parts of a local subdivision, as in the case of the present five year system. The only difference proposed is one of degree, i.e. the lag in reassessing all portions of an entire local subdivision would be three years instead of five years. Nevertheless, under the provisions of House Bill No. 13, at least 1/3 of a given area would always be subjected to different assessment treatment and in all probability pay a larger amount of taxes proportionately than the areas thereafter to be reassessed.

It has been said that the bill is necessary in order to furnish a constantly increasing tax base to permit future local bond issues. This presupposes that reassessments must and will always produce increases in existing assessments. In a period of high values this is undoubtedly true, but the converse may well follow. Furthermore, the present law authorizes reassessment of the entire area in a one or two year period.

It is also contended that new or newly improved property cannot be assessed after the provisions of the present law become effective on January 1, 1954. I find nothing in the existing law which can possibly prevent adding such property to the assessment base.

Further, it is claimed that the inability to use the rotational system of assessment will require a rise in local tax rates. I believe that the people have long since progressed beyond the point where an increase in assessment while holding down the tax rate, in any way misleads them. Taxpayers are interested in the total amount of their tax bill, whatever formula may be used to arrive at the burden imposed upon them. Under the existing law which will become effective on January 1, 1954, at the end of the five year rotational system, all parts of each local subdivision will at least theoretically be on an equal basis. One-third of each area will then be appraised each year for three years, with all of the reassessment notices being sent out in the third year. In this manner, equality will be preserved. As I have pointed out above, the three year period for reassessment is a maximum and any local subdivision can reassess its entire area and make such assessments effective in a one year or two-year period, if desired.

The Attorney General has advised me that the bill is unconstitutional because the House and the Senate passed different versions of the bill. Aside from the fact that the constitutional issue seems clear to me, I do not feel that this is a question which can be left for determination of the