the Legislatures of the future to say that when this amendment
was passed we, as a Legislature, intended future Legislatures to
be able to address issues as they arose. And certainly we have
seen situations reverse themselves in just the brief period of
time that I've been here, and we can see it again. And a
punitive Legislature might very well decide, in the future, that
since we have repealed the uniformity clause, even in the manner
which we are attempting to do here,...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...that we ought to then regulate agriculture
or regulate production through the taxation method. I have seen
that happen in the past and I can anticipate it happening again
in the future. So, therefore, I would suggest, Senator Johnson,
that you expand your amendment to take care of the disparate
treatment within the classes so that it is not left to
conjecture and speculation, but that it is spelled out.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature,
this is an issue that could be somewhat difficult for a person
to vote on, if emotions or feelings are allowed to play a part.
If you look at the way the amendment is drafted, right now, the
word used is different not less. So a different classification
could result in agricultural land being taxed at a higher rate
than residential property. I'd like to ask Senator Johnson a
question. And, Senator Johnson, so you won't feel that I'm
hostile, as a mint condition "Repelican", it's one "Repelican"
addressing another, so we're both members of the same party, so
these other considerations won't enter in. The question I have
is, what percentage, if you know, of agricultural...is
agricultural land, what percentage of the land in Nebraska is
agricultural land?

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: I don't have those figures in front of me,
I'm sorry.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, thank you. Senator Hefner, do you
have...

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: If there's someone that might have, then
I'd be happy to have them share it with you.