

January 8, 1974

not bad in itself. I think that the same people are paying those taxes should have a right to the use of this land, as if it were a state park land, to picnic on or to hunt on or any other fashion that state park land is used wherever that is possible. And I think if we're going to be fair to the taxpayers this is the only fair way to adopt this bill.

PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes Senator Syas, then Nore, then Fred Carstens.

SENATOR SYAS: We took the tax off my refrigerator. And if I had any intangible tax, we took the tax off that. That doesn't mean you can come into my house and use my refrigerator. It doesn't mean that you can cash my bonds and stocks because I no longer pay tax on them. We give a homestead exemption that doesn't mean I can move into somebody's house because they have a homestead exemption. This is getting a little bit ridiculous. Now for Senator Stahmer, I'm going to say again. The Federal Constitution requires, and so does the State Constitution, that government cannot take property without due process of law. Which simply means you the government must condemn, and pay the owner for the land or property, or whatever it is. This bill doesn't allow condemnation because government already has condemnation. If you're an owner of some of these lands you do not have to allow public access. I'm opposed to public access in the bill, because that would make the constitutional amendment itself unconstitutional in my opinion. Because when you have to be told by government that you have to allow public access, not only in my view are you violating the Federal Constitution because you're taking property, my rights as an owner away from me without due process of law. If any of these people want public access they had better see the government some place along the line that can condemn it. And buy it. That's one of our great things in the American society, is when..the.. is when you own public property I mean own private property that the government can't take it away from you. That's one of the great things that makes our system of government so good in comparison to a communistic country where the government can confiscate or a dictatorial government. Turn this amendment down and let's advance the bill. This would kill the bill actually. And I don't know what Stahmer is trying to pull. If he doesn't want this bill. He's got a red button on his desk.

PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes Senator Fred Carstens.

SENATOR CARSTENS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I have to agree with Senator Syas that to put this amendment on the bill would be the death of the bill. We cannot compel confiscation. Which this would amount to. This would amount to confiscation without any payment whatever. Because it would give the public access to property without the additional burden of having to preserve and protect that property. And unrestricted public access would, what this would be, means that the public would destroy or by one means or another cutting down timber, trampling it down, running over it with automobiles, snowmobiles, God knows what, it would serve nobody any purpose and in the end it would all be ruined, and the landowner would be stuck with a defaced landscape with nothing else to show for it except the relief of the tax burden, but nobody would have anything. And this is a bad attempt to, I don't know if it is an attempt to kill the bill. But if you want to do something about this bill vote no, but if you don't want it. But don't try to kill it indirectly.

4502