

for the granting of future exemptions. And I think this is a...this is a standard that at least we know will be there because I think the one thing we can say with certainty is that whatever happens, eventually whatever statutory scheme we have of exempting or not exempting personal, real property, all property is going to end up in court. There will be a court test, a court test that relates directly to the Nebraska Constitution. And I think that the one assurance that the Kristensen amendment gives us is that at least there is a standard of reasonableness in the Constitution for the granting of future exemptions. And I guess, you know, it comes to the point where what I think is reasonable and what Senator Moore thinks is reasonable are going to be two very different things, I'm sure. But at least this gives the court a standard to look at. There's at least, I think, a general definition of what reasonable means in a person's mind and I think the court can take this provision, they can look at the exemptions that are made in the context of the policy decisions that the Legislature is making and at least this gives a standard that we know the court eventually bumps up against within the Nebraska Constitution and alleviates some of the fears that those of us on all sides of this debate have about what could happen without a standard in the Constitution as far as future exemptions go and what it does to the people that we represent. I would urge that you support the Kristensen amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members, I rise to oppose the Kristensen amendment. As I understand it, the amendment would take the place of the Lindsay amendment. Is that correct, Doug? So the answer, for the record, was, yes, that it strikes the Lindsay amendment and becomes the amendment itself. The Lindsay amendment did allow for the special legislation provision as it would apply to any additional exemptions. The special legislation clause in the Nebraska Constitution has been there since 1875, since the constitutional change that that Constitution was written, in 1875, and it has remained there virtually unchanged. It is...the language in it has remained unchanged. It has been applied on a number of occasions but it has not been something that has been overworked by the courts in terms of throwing out legislation that this body or its predecessor bodies put into place. The issue here with regard to what we're doing in 219, as it relates to reasonableness, is, I guess, arguing...it's the same argument