

SENATOR ABBODD: ...that they were being discriminated against. But then other groups jumped on and why not? They were willing to take the chance. Pipelines got involved, telecommunications got involved and all of a sudden we had a crisis in the state. Now really the issue is this. We're betting, with this piece of legislation, that the Supreme Court is going to say we're going to take the next step, even though they have absolutely no grounds whatsoever, they're going to take the next step and state we're going to declare all personal property and businesses as unconstitutional. I, for one, don't feel they're going to take that step. I could be wrong. I could be wrong. But they are taking an awfully large step. Now how does this figure in? How does this particular amendment figure into that entire scheme? Well, I view this particular amendment as a rather small, small piece of sand in a rather large sandy beach. It's a small, small item because...

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR ABBODD: ...we're looking at the entire question of personal property business exemptions. It's a very small item, but it means so much to this state. I'll speak if I have time with...later, but I oppose this amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'm going to temporarily support Senator Hall's amendment because I will have an amendment offering a little bit later that will strike it. Now, let me explain. As I've been hearing the discussions this morning, there is...essentially we've been talking two things. There isn't any question in my mind that the issue of any exemption as things stand today, however meritorious, is constitutionally suspect, as Senator Kristensen has spoken just a few minutes ago, and, as I recall, much of the discussion was how do we make sure that we keep everybody's interest in working our way through the 3-R Committee and the other activity that the Legislature and Governor's office will be doing and you essentially talked about two options, one of which is put everything on, and I cannot politically rationalize, as Senator Moore has pointed out, how I could conceivably leave anything as an exemption if my argument is that we're going to put everything back on at a future date to ensure everybody's interest. There is no way you can justify that. The other option I've heard is, oh, we take everything