

there before. There used to be some connection between the payment of taxes and the right to vote. That doesn't exist anymore and it's probably a good thing, but it also has opened the door to indiscriminate spending and some lack of responsibility on the part of those of us who are in office. And I know that there are those who will come back and say well we've just sort of spaced off household goods and personal property. Ladies and gentlemen, I do not have an estimate but I would guess that there are billions of dollars worth of household furniture and personal effects out there that ought to be considered as a part of the total tax picture. Therefore, I think Senator Owen Elmer makes an excellent argument for his amendment. In response to Senator Moore's concern, I believe that it is also reasonable that Senator Owen Elmer takes the issue one bite at a time and that he first offers this amendment and then that we later offer additional amendments to make the package, the tax package, complete. I continually question how serious this body is about a fair and equitable tax proposal when we continue to want to zero in on a program which will tax only a very small minority of the individuals. To pass this amendment and then to pass the bill would be to bring about the best in all of us I think and to require the most, the ultimate statesmanship when we go back home and explain to our constituents that the court said it all goes back on. Does all mean all or does it only mean livestock, farm equipment and business inventory?

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I think, ladies and gentlemen, all means all and Senator Owen Elmer has taken the first step in that direction. I support the amendment and I support also any subsequent amendments to add the other items to this proposal.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Schmit. Senator Withem, you're next.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I would stand in opposition to the Elmer amendment. First of all, I know some of us in here when we throw our rhetoric around as our shorthand methodology of describing what happens if a constitutional amendment doesn't pass, if no legislation passes, we use the terminology it all goes back on. Senator Schmit, if that was part of the point you were making, you made a valuable point in it doesn't all go back on depending on what your