

the bill in committee and I did not support striking it. And again the issue with me is not...is not 775. I don't believe anybody would argue that those exemptions that were contained in 775 would not...would have been there if the big four, as they're referred to, was not presumed to be constitutional, that those provisions of the constitution permitted that to happen. And I cannot, in good conscience, knowing full well, at least believing full well that those provisions in 775 were adopted because of a belief that we could do that, as well as the big four, I cannot possibly see how you could pick those out as a class and leave the rest of them out. So to me it becomes an issue of tax policy and the tax policy if the Constitution doesn't permit, it shouldn't...just simply should not be done. If the concept is that we're going to wait till every court...every item is ran through the courts on this issue, we're going to be waiting for three or four years, I guess, before we know all those things. I see absolutely no rationale whatsoever. You might develop some kind of a rationale if the court had some kind of language in there that made reference to a purpose. I see absolutely no rationale for earthmoving equipment. Earth moving equipment that someone has for building terraces, a whole bunch of farmers have the same piece of equipment and they go out and rebuild their own terraces, yet if you own any earthmoving equipment it is exempt but there is no logic, constitutionally, that you can defend that. I don't want to rehash 775 either but what I do want to do is try to have some...some level of consistency in what we're doing in the event that all this property is to go back on the tax rolls. And the only way that we're going to get this test that has been mentioned, if we're going to run everything up the courts, is that some citizen has to bear the cost to do it. Now there wasn't any citizen who ran the case to the Supreme Court, it was a very large corporation who made that test. And there isn't a soul, I would suspect, that is in the state that is going to go challenge those computers and pay the cost out of their pocket on the basis of getting the test, maybe somebody might, but I doubt it. And so I think it falls back that the basis for doing it in the first place was a belief that we could do that kind of exemption on big equipment and now we find out...or on the big four, and now we find we cannot and I don't think we can do any and I don't think we ought to do any. And the only other argument left is there is a contract and I don't disagree that there is a contract but I also suspect that a contract for an unconstitutional act cannot be done either. It's not a valid contract. And if there is to be a test, I suspect that's where