

stop border bleeding, Senator Lamb, and which border are you next to? I'm next to two borders and I say that border bleeding has gone down. Let's don't say border bleeding, tax the farmer, take it off the sales tax due to border bleeding 'cause that's not a problem any more. We've solved that problem. With the help of the Revenue Committee, Senator Hall and et cetera, we solved that problem by giving the Department of Revenue more money. But let's go ahead and tax them. They're not here. They're not being represented. There are not enough votes to stop it. Some of your farm folks, you know, if you compare the energy tax to the fertilizer tax, the fertilizer tax takes in consideration the dryland farmer who raises wheat, who isn't doing very good. The man who has the irrigation pivot machine is doing better. So I would ask you to oppose taxing fertilizer 4 dollars a ton and it's not fair. It's not across the board. Thank you, Mr. President (sic). I think it's (inaudible). Madam President, thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Haberman. Senator Ashford. Do I see sufficient seconds? I do. We will now vote on the motion to cease debate. All those in favor please vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted on the motion to cease debate? Please record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 5 nays to cease debate, Madam President.

PRESIDENT MOUL: We have ceased debate and I'll recognize Senator Lindsay for closing.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President and members. Looks like I got myself up to my knees in fertilizer. (Laugh) I'd like to respond first to Senator Haberman talking about how I got my name on this amendment simply because I don't have to pay the tax. That, of course, presumes that I pay a lot of tax on my farm machinery and I pay a lot of tax on my energy usage that I use on my farm, so I don't think the argument goes. I don't pay any of these taxes, Senator Haberman. This, my name is on this amendment for one reason, that's I happened to be the farthest up in line when we had to substitute an amendment. If this amendment's accepted, it will bring on a few rural votes. That's what I've been told. If this amendment is rejected, it won't bring those votes on. It's kind of that simple. It's trading of different kinds of tax within the particular sector. It's not intended to create a larger burden on the particular sector, on any particular sector, as opposed to what was already