

thought. But a constitutional amendment, even more than a statute, ought not be drafted so it is understood, it ought to be drafted so that it cannot be misunderstood. I have just returned from about my fourth or fifth trip to the Rotunda. And I can tell you that among the proponents of LR 2CA there is wide disagreement as to how they understand the implication of the amendment. There is general agreement, ladies and gentlemen, that if you repeal the uniformity clause in the manner in which we have done it thus far, with LR 2CA, that it does not limit future Legislatures from taking a position by statute which says that we could tax agricultural land at twice the market value. It does not say...It would also allow, I believe, unless we specifically provide for language, that there must be uniformity within classes, that anything over 160 acres should be taxed at a different rate than is the land under 160 acres. Now if you do not want that to occur, then we, as a Legislature, have an obligation and a responsibility to place that language in the constitutional amendment. We should not naively assume that 20 years from now, when most of us will probably not be here, that the future Legislatures will understand what we meant, or that they may say, well, nonetheless they left it wide open because of changing times and changing conditions. We certainly can all remember when Prudential Insurance Company began to buy land in western Nebraska and developed it for agricultural purposes, that there was knee jerk reaction which resulted in the aiding and abetting of the constitutional language which prohibited the ownership of land by corporations, notwithstanding the fact that for many years on this floor that language had been defeated by the Legislature. But the conditions were right and the surrounding feeling by people that we had to protect...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...the ownership of the land from huge corporations resulted in the passage of 300. Right or wrong, it will be determined in the future. But the point is it's in the Constitution. And we want to make this clear. Third, I think Senator Chambers raised a point which has gone over the heads of most of us. If, in fact, there is disparity in the valuation of agricultural land at the present time, and if we, by virtue of the passage of 361, raise the valuation of land, we will lower the taxes paid by small towns. Then when this bill becomes...when this amendment becomes a part of the Constitution we're going to lower those taxes again on agricultural land and raise them on the small towns. We are going to create some