

preference but a preference that springs from a hard truth. The hard truth is that the holding of property is not equivalent to one's wealth, particularly in the farm setting. Thirty percent of the property taxes in this state are collected from agricultural land. Nine percent of the income that is generated in this state is generated from agricultural pursuits. Compare those numbers again. Thirty percent of the taxes paid that are property taxes are taxes on agricultural land. The income from that land represents only 9 percent of the state's income. Now that's an important difference, and because there is such a difference between those two numbers, the property taxes that are paid but the income that supports it, we have used a wide variety of methods to get around that difference and to make sure there is some attempt to bridge the gap. In some cases, they are Class I schools. In other cases, it's been county commissioners and state boards of equalizations that have over time winked at the undervaluation of agricultural land. We have had school land funds that have had money sent to counties on bases that basically were justified on what they meant to rural counties. We have had state aid fights here and aid distribution fights here that are basically meant to cut against this hard fact. Thirty percent of the property taxes are paid by agricultural land, 9 percent of the income of the state comes from agricultural pursuits. That's a hard fact. My constituency taught me a lesson four years ago. They said, we're prepared to make some adjustments here. And I don't think it's anything strange. This body passed LB 662, the public took it off the rolls, they took it off the law books. We didn't introduce an LB 662 the next year. This Legislature passed a seat belt law. The public took it off the law books. We didn't put a seat belt law in the next year. We have historically honored what our voters have told us when they have acted in their capacity as writers of organic law, of fundamental law, of oversight of our work. In the same way that we would think it arrogant to reverse the judgment of the public the year after they voted safety belts out, it would be arrogant not to return to the public the right to decide this question again which is exactly what the public apparently wanted four years ago and for which I have seen no reason to believe they have changed their minds.

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: It seems to me our obligation to give this question to them. I can tell you, frankly, there is a stumbling