

an unforeseen problem with the drafting of Amendment 4 in 1984. I think when the Legislature in its special session that year put this measure on the ballot, it was debated extensively at that time and there was great concern in the rural sector that such a provision cannot be enacted on the heels of another pro-ag constitutional amendment that had been enacted two years before, but the vote was resounding. For those of you who don't remember what the vote was, in the votes for LR 4 in 1984 was 411,868 people supported that amendment as opposed to 175,546 who opposed it. An overwhelming majority of the people of this state felt that it was fair, right and proper to treat agricultural land a little bit differently because of the variety of reasons and the problems with assessing agricultural land. Now, Senator Johnson rose with measured anger in his opposition to this amendment. He rose and said those greedy farmers, those greedy farmers, they want tax breaks. He rose and he said that the people when they wrote the Constitution, they were protecting it against these greedy people that are out to get tax breaks, for that reason the uniformity clause was written in there. Well, I'm not a constitutional expert and neither am I a tax break expert, Senator Johnson, but...tax specialist, excuse me, but I have the sneaking suspicion the people that wrote that uniformity clause in there, the reason that uniformity clause is in there is not because of the masses and because of the farmers out there. The reason it was in there was their concern over a select powerful interest group taking control and being treated unfairly, the railroads as Senator Johnson said. Now I guess I would like to...I would wonder if we would have been wise in '69 when we wrote our sales and income tax statutes, if we would have had some sort of uniformity clause in that Constitution because then the very tax break that I gave corporations last year along with Senator Johnson, for good reasons I might add, that would have been prohibited. They may not have been a bad idea. But I think it's only fair, right and proper at this time when the people spoke loud and clear in '84 by our mistake or whoever's mistake it was, that LR 4 was not written properly. I think it's only fair at this time, this body advance LR 249 and let the people say what they may again.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Wehrbein, then Senator Scofield.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. President and members, I have the answers to Senator Wesely's question and I don't see him here, but if he is listening I hope he will hear. Those were good questions.