

amendment that maybe you should really be thinking about. First of all, whatever exemptions that we would put in place next year...let's say...let's say we passed the Governor's amendment, and nothing was done under the Constitution, everything was done by statute, it would be done on the basis of 25 votes. Well, business inventory, farm inventory, those things that would be protected next year might not be the same things that would be protected in the year 2001. And I think I want to say this without...to just recognize a fact and not to be arguing on one side or another, although I necessarily come from an urban area. The fact is that with the turning of this next century there will be an historic turn in the way practically that this Legislature operates. It will be...it's becoming more urban, the forces will be more balanced. It may be that in the year 2001 some of the exemptions will be in jeopardy. Now I think we have to look honestly at the history of the state and say probably the advantage on exemptions has been to the rural area simply because historically the rural areas have controlled the Legislatures. That's not saying something bad. That's not saying something negative. That's recognizing the majority of the populations, the interest that's...you know, I would...it's the way you vote representing the people that you come from. So that's all there is to it. It's not good or bad. But that's going to change. And I'm suggesting to you that maybe it might make some sense to you to put into the Constitution some protection that would be there beyond the year 2001 that would recognize something that we philosophically all believe is true but we might be inclined to change for practical political reasons in the year 2001. I am willing to say today, for example, that I think farm inventories should be treated the same as business inventories, grain and fertilizer, philosophically, I believe that those should not be taxed. In the year 2002, my constituents might convince Chris Beutler or somebody like me that maybe those things should be taxed, even though I philosophically individually disagreed. The point is this is an opportunity to do something that we all believe is philosophically correct and to build in protections over time that will apply to the rural areas as well as to the urban areas. There is a very strong argument you should do this for the long term protection of the rural interest. Now let me talk about the equal protection clause a little bit and I would be interested in Senator Kristensen's and the reflections of some of the other lawyers on this. Point number two as to why maybe it makes some sense to protect yourself now and this is a more practical argument than a fundamental legal argument but it goes