

Kristensen, would you respond to a question?

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR HALL: Senator Kristensen, for the record, since this is your amendment, what is your definition of reasonable, as it relates to an exemption?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Reasonable would have to...and I'm going to refer to some of the documents, Senator Hall, that I have, and if you will give me just two seconds, I can certainly give you...

SENATOR HALL: Sure, that would be fine.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Because I don't want to do this off the top of my head. Okay, my definition of things that are reasonable, that are not based on subjective items, they're done on objective manner. It's a standard of objectivity and not subjectivity. It's based on some ability to have a clear and definite reason for what you're doing and that it gives you...I'm searching, I suppose the word fair starts to creep into that definition, if you would look at it in the dictionary to do it.

SENATOR HALL: Yeah, that four-letter F word tends to creep in there once in a while.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: And, you know, Senator Hall, that word is probably what we elusively try to find with every piece of legislation in every constitutional amendment.

SENATOR HALL: Senator Kristensen, is it your belief that under that definition of fairness or reasonableness, as it would be amended into this constitutional amendment, that the exemptions that existed prior to MAPCO would have met that test?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, I've got to...I've got to make sure I understand exactly what you're saying. The...the big four exemptions that were thrown out by MAPCO, the Stahmer overrulings, would they, under this current Constitution...

SENATOR HALL: Would they...would they meet...would they meet