

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Debate has ceased. Senator Lindsay, would you like to close on your motion, please.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Mr. President. I didn't bring this amendment because I am a big fan of the airline industry or because I have gotten big campaign contributions from the airline industry. I really had no contact until I was approached about this amendment. This amendment was brought because there is a problem with the bill. Well, there is probably several problems with the bill, but there is this problem with this bill. Senator Warner and Senator Hall correctly point out that there are differences between the 4-R Act and this particular act. One of those, and the reason, I think the primary motivating reason why the airlines did not challenge in the same manner that the railroads did is because the 4-R Act specifically allows for federal injunctive relief, whereas this particular act does not allow for that type of relief. They didn't have that option available to them. Again, I think we are going to see a challenge to this bill, and I think one of the...probably the first successful challenge to this bill will be based on this particular area. I can certainly...I should go back a little bit, and I was caught off guard a little bit when this amendment was called. It came up a little earlier than I thought. I didn't have my thoughts collected completely, what thoughts are there. This bill or this amendment is designed, it does not exempt the airline industry just completely. What it exempts is a particular segment of that, that segment that, basically, is comparable to rolling stock in the railroad industry. It does not exempt the ground equipment. It does not exempt the ticket counters or what have you. Any of the equipment that is located on the ground is not going to be affected. It will continue to be taxed in the same manner. What we are talking about, as Senator Hall points out, is we are talking about a \$1.8 million hit on that property. I believe this is going to be hitting, as you might guess, primarily Douglas and Lancaster, the counties that have the larger airports. It is an amendment I think that directly impacts upon those counties. With that, I certainly can see the mood of the body. I would urge the adoption of the amendment, and suggest that let's I guess not plug a loophole, let's create or stop the crumbling of this act in this particular area of the dike. It is not a loophole. It is the