

difficult for people to be served, if you will, by the dollars that they pay to us to serve them. And I think that this is our obligation, is to make things as simple as we possibly can for the people that we serve. Therefore this makes absolute sense. It gives us every reason to support this amendment, and it does nothing more than that. Why? Isn't anyone listening when they go back into their districts and they listen to people that tell them that government is too big, government is not responsive to our wishes, government must not care about us because all you do is throw more paperwork, more bureaucracy at us all the time. What can you do to reduce government? This is absolutely a perfect place for us to take a stand and to say, yes, we do care about you; yes, we are listening to you; yes, we want to eliminate the bureaucracy. And for no other reasons we should support Senator Moore's amendment on the basis of common sense, and I urge your support also.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Byars. Senator Ashford, followed by Senators Haberman and Schmit.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise to oppose the Moore amendment for many of the reasons, again, that Senator Hall raised. But if we read...But I would add a couple other points. I certainly am not convinced, by Senator Byars' argument, that this will...amendment will reduce recordkeeping. In fact, as of yet I have ever...I have not heard a compelling argument that recordkeeping will not, in fact, be increased by a system that does not tag the reporting to the actual purchase. And I think we actually will save time and money by not adopting, at least from what I'm hearing now, by not adopting the amendment. But I certainly will try to listen to that. But the second reason that I would oppose it is again going back to what Senator Hall said, if we haven't learned anything from the recent Supreme Court cases, the one thing I hope we have learned is that when we create exemptions, we create constitutional problems. Back in the days of the Stahmer case, when the state was adequately funding, or at least funding to a greater level, or an adequate level, exemptions that we were creating in the personal property tax system, we did not have the constitutional crisis that we have now. When we create a straight exemption in sales tax we are, in effect, rubbing against the problem that has been raised time and time again by our Supreme Court. So I think it certainly, not only does it send the wrong message, it creates another notch in the legal tree, in a sense, that the Supreme Court has tried to tell