

going to make that pronouncement because of it's a rule in here that we do that for all bills?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay. Thank you. With that I hope that that will explain why I will vote no and I would urge others to do so, thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President, members, I start off first by recognizing, may have already been recognized, but over under the balcony we say Terry Harter (phonetic) there and I think she ought to be complimented with, Morgan Kristensen is over there, just a doll, and I think we've all seen that and Terry has to be complimented for doing what she could with Senator Kristensen's gene pool to come up with a doll like that. That having been stated about Senator Kristensen, I think it's appropriate that Morgan Kristensen is down there or is over here now, although I would mention that had Morgan been born this session instead of last session, she probably would have been named Peffer instead of Morgan. (Laughter.) Let me get back to the bill. I have to disagree with my colleague, Senator Kristensen, that this is clearly unconstitutional or subject to attack on a basis of constitutionality done with several subjects. I don't believe so. It's a heck of a lot closer than a lot of stuff we passed in here and whether that may or may not be a good defense of it, I think the defense is he focuses on breeding livestock, he focuses on auditorium, he focuses on fertilizer, but what he forgets is the second half of each of those, it's taxation. The bill deals with taxation and it deals with where that taxation goes. It's...I think, clearly a one subject bill. I think it falls squarely within the constitutional limitations on this body. I simply don't...I just must disagree with his analysis that it is unconstitutional. He can certainly make the argument regarding whether it is good policy or whether there may be a constitutionality issue with regards to the breeding livestock and a question on exemptions, can make that argument. I think the Supreme Court has really yet to speak on that and I think anybody's guess on what they would do with that is as good as anybody else's. I guess what I wanted to focus on was how the bill, certainly there's parts of it...I'm more comfortable with