

Senator Withem defined it, all of the things that were addressed in the MAPCO would be back on the tax rolls and that is what might like to be happening. But I wouldn't think that benighted opinion would lie within any breast in this body. Heavens, we know what business inventory and livestock inventory taxes would do to this state, very bad. And I would continue to ask you to think positively about this minor adjustment and let us go forward with a CA and a bill that we can sell and has a chance to be passed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, or Madam President, now. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL PRESIDING

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator. I'll now recognize Senator Wehrbein followed by Senators Coordsen, Moore, Hefner, Schmit, Schellpeper and Withem. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Madam President and members, I felt compelled to say something about this because I did introduce a bill along this very line to bring up the point that household goods should be included in all in my opinion. It was interesting in the hearing, I was the only introducer, there was no one behind me to oppose it, no one behind me to support it and I didn't even bother to close so obviously it didn't have much interest in a hearing. But it does seem to me, based on Judge Shanahan's logic also, and I realize he was a minority opinion in this case, that all should mean all should mean all. And even if this body decides not to do anything with this amendment at this point, which I won't be surprised if they don't, it seems to me that the logic ought to be there that if, in fact, something...the amendment doesn't pass in May, that household goods ought ultimately to be vulnerable to being put back on simply because the right question wasn't asked as I would understand some of it in the court opinion, the right question being asked might come to liking household goods back on. Just because it would be an administrative nightmare or whatever doesn't seem to stop the court in many other cases. So it seems to me if we're really to follow what the Constitution says, we can't really back away from household goods simply because they would be hard to administrate. It doesn't make sense to me in the long run to do household goods. But on the other hand, as we go along this path of potentially putting everything back on, then it seems to me surely they all should be put back on. I've made the point many times that actually the amount of value on household goods based on the 50 percent factor that Senator