the problem because our good friends in the farm organizations who didn't know where they were going with 271, didn't know where they were going with Amendment 4, didn't know where they were going with any of the rest of the bills we have had, now come back and say, because we have not known where we have been going for five years or six years, we are going to assume we know where we're going this time. Ladies and gentlemen, that's a very poor precedent.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Schellpeper, please, followed by Senator Landis.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Mr. President, and members, I also rise to support this resolution. I think that this is something that we have to have for rural Nebraska. I am a firm believer that the voters of Nebraska would approve this resolution. Last summer we had several meetings on this issue and I was one of the senators that thought we should put this on the ballot last fall, that we are waiting too long, we should have done it last fall. But I think we can't go back now so we need to go forward and we need to get it so we can have it on the ballot for the next election. This is very important for rural Nebraska. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Landis, please, followed by Senator Hall.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I want to address my comments basically to my urban colleagues because I intend to support this amendment and I want to try to create a case for you to be able to support it as well. years ago we had a special session. At that time we voted whether or not to put Amendment 4 on the ballot. against that amendment. Didn't want to see a change in the Constitution. I was convinced that it was not particularly good policy. It was reported out from the special session, went on the ballot. My constituency voted for that amendment two to one. What do they think they were doing? In my estimation, they thought this allows us to value ag land differently than other types of property. It will allow us to value it at its ability to earn income. It means that we're going to have a special way of treating agricultural land as opposed to other of lands and maintain what has been a historical difference between agricultural land and other land. historical difference has been, in my estimation, a form of