

that about livestock it falls on deaf ears. When I say that about grain inventory it falls on deaf ears and I love the fact that Senator Hall smokes then out and says, I'm amazed at how the pastriches can sit back there and say, put farmers back on the tax rolls, put cars back on the tax rolls, but don't do us. And how this body can sit here and consider at the very beginning of the conversation to put an exemption in is amazing to me. It's amazing to me. I voted for 775, I support it, I do not want to repeal these exemptions. But if the ball game is going to be everything is under the gun, everything is going to be considered, then let's make it that way. Let's don't exempt anybody up front and say, you're too important, you're too immune from all this. I don't want to put tax back on these things even though I really did not like these exemptions and this is the one part of 775 I never did like. But how we can sit here and justify, I understand and I hate to draw the line between urban and rural, all my urban colleagues say, how can you consider taxing these things? How can you consider taxing livestock? We didn't become number one livestock state in the country by accident and that will put us in a very fine margin, the same argument applies to us. I think it's none of us versus them type things, but in some ways it kind of becomes that way when you have an amendment like this or when you talk against an amendment like this because if you want to put us all in the same package, let's do it. Don't exempt somebody out front. I'm reminded of four years ago when we started debating school consolidation. Many members of the body sat up and said, well, let's close those schools and Senator Lamb, the crafty old silver fox that he is, drafted an amendment to close Westside too and all the representatives from the Westside area stood up and said, why you couldn't do this, the exact same argument Senator Lamb has been giving them for 10 years probably. Now I wouldn't mind if you exempt this whole section of the bill, Senator Hall. I could live with that, but if you're going to put all things back on the tax rolls in '92, you're right, it has to include these things as well. That's what I think needs to happen and if you're going to start talking about everything but these people, I don't know how anybody in this body can go home because you're going to sit there and say, well, there isn't a segment of society that we do fear and tremble to. If we're going to talk about putting everything back on the tax rolls, the definition must mean everything or nothing at all. Simple as that. I think I rise to support Senator Hall's amendment. It includes everybody in that definition. I would take it another step farther, include everything including