

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...if we think that there is equivocation in that sentence, because there isn't. We need a constitutional amendment, we should not imperil the constitutional amendment by actions such as this amendment which adopt what I believe is a patently unconstitutional result. Vote against the amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Madam Speaker and members, if Senator Landis, to kind of follow up on that thought, given that clarity and lack of ability to move, do you...if that is so supreme and so basically obvious, how are household goods and charitable...charitable goods...are they not treated the same then? How can they not be. If that is the confines we are working under, you have to put it all on, does that not include charitable and household goods?

SENATOR LANDIS: The ones, as part of the delineation of that boundary, the court also identifies, in this case, what is in and what is out. The court reads that as a totality, but I don't think...I don't see the boundaries being pushed beyond what the court has announced in the decision.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, but if...it's not...it's not totality?

SENATOR LANDIS: The decision read in its totality identifies, I believe, the boundaries that this sentence indicates for us, and those are the terms of MAPCO.

SENATOR MOORE: It's just...just the four situations, and does not apply to the other things, in your opinion.

SENATOR LANDIS: In my opinion, yes.

SENATOR MOORE: Okay, and obviously once again we respectfully disagree on that. I...in no way can I rationalize how you could...if they're all in Section 2, how could you not treat them all the same. That's certainly my opinion. Senator Warner, if Senator Warner would yield to a question, please. Senator Warner, we had a dialogue in our last question and answer about what happens, assuming the constitutional ballot, the constitutional question is on the ballot in May. I must now