

SPEAKER NICHOL: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, a little while ago someone said when we voted for Amendment 4 we didn't necessarily mean that we wanted to go away from the type of assessment that we now have. When you have an assessment you have a piece of property and you arrive at a figure of some kind and then you multiply it by the mill levy or the penny levy, whatever you want to call it now, and you come up with a figure. Let's say you have a farm at a certain value and you want to tax that farm \$1,000. You put in the political printout so that it comes out \$1,000. It doesn't matter whether you have a complicated form, like 271, or whether you have the old simple form that we have now, as long as you come out with \$1,000. I don't think it makes too much difference whether you use one or the other as long as you come out with \$1,000. I would also like to say that Senator Vard Johnson said a little bit ago that the farm organizations were supporting this type. Not necessarily so. What they were saying was they wanted some relief from their property taxes. They didn't say they wanted this formula as compared to the old one necessarily. What they want is a reduction in their taxes. I would like to say two or three things about the focus or the situation that was presented to the committee in saying it was a statement of the problem and the challenge to them. As I recall, it was Senator Vard Johnson that said to the committee what we would like to have is simplicity. You think this one is simplicity? You think this is understandable? I question that. You think this is rationality? Objectivity, I wouldn't know about that, but it sure as heck isn't the status quo. If all of these are met in this new formula, that is something. I'm suggesting again it isn't this bill that says that ag land is valued differently, although it is. But you simply need something to establish the value and something...and a multiplier to multiply that so you come out with your thousand bucks. In my opinion, this bill is very complicated. It certainly doesn't hold the status quo and I doubt if any of you could explain it to me now, and I've read this manual through twice. The rationality, of course, is entirely different, entirely different. Senator Warner has a point. If these valuations that we arrive at through our political printout are considerably higher than what that farm will bring on the open market, something is wrong. That was what was partially wrong with Marshal Swift. It was okay as long as the valuations were going up and they