

who are involved in the support of government, the less likely there is to be extravagances on the part of those of us who spend the money. I support the Elmer proposal.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schmit. Senator Schellpeper, followed by Senators Withem, Hall and Robinson. Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Madam President and members, I rise to support this amendment also. I think if you really want to help a bad bill and make it better, this will make it a lot better. And if you want to have a CA that the people will vote to approve, you need to have this amendment also. This is going to make sure that the CA is approved by the voters. If there had been a court challenge to 775 to the intangibles, to household goods, to earth moving equipment, that would also be going back on the tax rolls but they were not challenged and they need to be challenged also. This is a way to get at the household goods. I think the others need to be challenged too. If we're going to come up with a law or a tax solution that will stand the court test, then you need to make sure that this amendment goes on because it's something that needs to be part of the whole package. You can't come in and do a little piece here and a little piece there. It needs to be like the Supreme Court said, all needs to go back on or all needs to go off. This amendment is a good amendment, it's a fair amendment, it's a better tax policy than what we have at the present time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schellpeper. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Madam President, members of the body, just one other comment, I hope I won't use all of my time regarding why this amendment is not to be included is another distinction that the court has used, maybe not as much in MAPCO as in earlier decisions in distinguishing different types of property. They make a reference to income producing property and the rationale in excluding the personal property on pipelines I believe was because of what this Legislature had done in the arena of income producing property. I believe maybe, Senator Kristensen, if I'm right or wrong, that might have been when they began to make the distinction between household goods and personal effects because they are not income producing property. I am yet to be convinced that there is a need to do this and I don't understand