

bill, that if it fails, it fails. Somebody else can come up here and say here is how we are going to do it, whether it is rental, or going to market value, or going to some other new tax formula we have not even considered. That is fine with me. All I am asking for is fair treatment. I think the earnings capacity is the fairest treatment we have had. It is getting us closer to uniformity among all classes of property that we have got in the state. I don't see anything wrong with that, and this representation on the floor that we are going to get preferential treatment by this body is senseless. We know that and I am not trying to represent that to you. So I just ask you to reject this amendment, let's go to the next amendment. Hopefully that one would be adopted. We would have to bring the bill back to do that. At that time we can discuss this issue further, but we are spending an awful lot of time that I think it has been well-spent but I sense the body is wanting to move to other issues this morning, and we will have other opportunities, I think, if the bill is brought back, to discuss this motion. With that, I would give the remainder of my time to Senator Landis.

PRESIDENT: Senator Landis, you have a minute and a half, approximately.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make three points. I guess I will have time to make one of them, perhaps two. First, I hope that those of us who have been here long enough recall, particularly because of our salary issue, that we should learn a lesson about putting numbers into the Constitution. Conditions change, situations change, and percentages and dollar figures and numbers just don't do well in the Constitution. What you need are processes. You need standards, those kinds of things which can shift with time, but what you don't need is an absolute numeric identification of a target, and in this case, I think we would err by doing exactly that. Secondly, if you do this kind of language where you put 'his floor and ceiling, as far as valuation goes, you really have to use a market system, because what you are doing is you are establishing a form of preference, and you are coming down from the norm that other kinds of property are being valued at, and that would be a market-based system. In other words, you really couldn't use the earning capacity system with the Schmit amendment. And, in that sense, I think you place yourself at odds with the very entities that have supported Amendment 4, and 271, 1207 and LR 2CA...