

is a very important amendment with no justification and that is why I arise to oppose it. I passed out to the members of this body, and I would like to have those who are paying attention to this issue, to look through the maps that I passed out and, basically, those maps will show you in dark, sort of gray circles around the city those areas which are unincorporated. Now, frankly, the issue here is whether or not the greenbelt which was originally intended, and Senator Warner made this very clear in almost all of the legislative record, was intended to allow those individual people engaged in agricultural interest to remain in agricultural interest and not have to pay the higher price, the higher tax value of their property because they happened to be in the way of development. The purpose here was simply to say we don't want those people, who in the normal course of development, to have to pay a higher taxation and thereby make it harder for them to survive in their chosen endeavor, agricultural interest. At the same time, it was not intended to choke off all growth. That is why we used the zoning mechanisms and other mechanisms. Now the situation is simply this. Six percent was the going interest rate when this bill was originally passed. There was no special interest rate. There was no arbitrary low interest rate and I don't see anything in the record to indicate that six percent was in any way sort of a special sort of a situation. In fact, that was basically the going interest rate and the purpose for this thing, this whole question of interest rate, is whether or not the agricultural user if he applies for and receives a homestead exemption will, in fact, get a break, whether he should, in fact, be given an incentive to hold his land. Now when you refer to the maps you will see that in Douglas County, which does not have a growth mechanism, as does Lancaster County, does not...uses SIDs and allows SIDs to grow, but what is happening is is that many individuals have chosen to hold their land until the development of the city has grown up around them. Now what happens in that situation when the development has grown up around them and they choose to go further and further out because they can't buy the land that really is in the normal growth pattern, they have to go further out. Now what we are saying is is that we don't want to encourage urban sprawl by providing...making it even easier for this individual to make a larger amount of money, pay a smaller amount of interest, if he waits in fact for a longer and longer period of time and forces development further away from the city, further out from the city, especially in those cities that use the SID mechanism, to allow this to be a break or to be basically a speculative sort of venture. Now the question of six percent, I have heard Senator Warner's arguments for this