

part of what we're asking the Attorney General to clarify for us.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Okay. Well, I believe that if you will go back and read the court decision, the court decision stated bluntly that the Revenue Committee at that special session had before them, I believe they called it LR 1, a bill by DeCamp and Pappas and Haberman, which did, in fact, strike the uniformity clause. And to paraphrase what the court said, I believe they said since the Legislature chose not to strike that language, then they apparently did not mean that it...that they were wanting to abandon the uniformity procedure. You have got to...if you want to do what some of...what almost everyone here except Senator Hall wants to do, then you've got to strike the uniform and proportionate clause in the bill, I think. The other thing is that I think we are walking into a really major trap if you do not...if you do not limit the direction in which the variation can go. I want as big a slice of the pie as I can get but I don't want to get hauled off to slaughter. Senator Owen Elmer told about a steer that he tried to butcher and he said, I couldn't get him up the chute, and I had to shoot him on the lot and load him with a loader and take him to the slaughterhouse. Well, if that's what's going to happen to me, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to have to shoot me on the floor and load me up and haul me out, I'm not going to willingly walk up the chute and put another \$50 million of taxes in one year on the valuation of farmland. You have, with this amendment, I believe, started down the road where...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...there is all kinds of mischief available to anyone who wants to jockey around with it. I come back to what Senator Hall said, we want to be fair and we want to be equitable. None of us want to have an unfair advantage and I really believe that. I don't believe the urban legislators...I appreciate Senator Landis's remarks, the urban legislators do not want to take unfair advantage but they have not...it has not been proven to me that this constitutional amendment will, first of all, pass the muster of the court. Second, I think, as indefinite as it is, it is an open invitation toward rejection by the people. I have an amendment which I may offer which will not be easy to pass by the people but, if it is passed by the people, will definitely tell us what direction and tell the court what direction we want to go, how we are going to get