

would urge the body to adopt the amendment. I think it is sensible and I can see no justifiable reason for allowing these trucks to operate at this particular level. We are all aware of the problems we have with our roads and I just don't think it is good public policy as a Legislature to allow these vehicles to operate at that particular level. I haven't talked with Senator Warner about it but I think he makes good sense in his presentation and I think that we should adopt the amendment, bring the bill back and adopt the amendment because I think it is justified.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the body, I would just raise the question. I think that we would be setting aside an unconstitutional class if we did adopt the amendment, which, of course, then would immediately throw the bill out and the bill would be null and void. I would like to ask Senator Warner, I suppose, a question of whether or not there is any logical basis for treating sugar beets from a stockpile different than corn or some other grain from a stockpile.

SENATOR WARNER: What was the question?

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Is there any logical basis for us to consider that we should treat corn from a stockpile differently than we treat sugar beets from a stockpile and are we not, in fact, creating an unconstitutional class with your amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Senator, I don't know if I can argue if it is an unconstitutional class any more so than to pick out farm products as opposed to ice boxes. The argument, I understood on the floor, was that sugar beets was really the crucial problem and that would be allowed under the provision but there would be no allowance for overweight on other farm products whether it was a commercial or a farm truck.

SENATOR SCHMIT: One more question then, what about the overweight provisions for garbage trucks? Would that be treated the same way then? Could you, do you think, logically say, yes, we can allow garbage to be over the