

co-introducer.

That is all that I have, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Just a gentle suggestion to the body. We are discussing the Landis amendment to the committee amendments. I would ask members to confine their remarks, if possible, to that particular subject. I will go through the list of lights. If you would like to speak to the amendment to the amendment, there will be adequate time. Senator Wesely. Senator Schmit. Senator Schmit, on the amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR SCHMIT Just very briefly. I would like to have a question of Senator Vard Johnson if he would answer, please.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Vard, please.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator Johnson, just how many companies do you think would be impacted by this amendment which Senator Landis is trying to strike?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Oh, I don't think very many, Senator Schmit. Probably not more than a half a dozen. But I don't know, I would imagine...these...we're are talking about jet aircraft.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I guess I have watched all sorts of amendments and all sorts of bill drafting activity, some of it chicanery, but this would appear to me to be perhaps the most narrow classification of personal property that I have ever seen in 20 years. Would you not agree, Senator Johnson? It's a pretty narrow classification.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: The Attorney General gave us an opinion which indicated that we may have as narrow a classification as we desire so long as there is a rational basis for the classification, which I will explain later on.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, I guess with the Attorney General's net worth, he probably would agree that's a pretty good classification. It might not seem the same out in my county, my county attorney. I guess I am torn on this amendment, Senator Landis. I can see where Senator Landis is coming from. He is