

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, it's not unusual that I would stand alone on this issue, or stand in very sparse company. I'm not embarrassed to do so. Senator Landis said it might have been different if someone else's name had been on the bill. I am pleased at least they acknowledge that the earnings capacity suggestion was my idea. It is how you arrive at that capacity. It comes back to what I have said here of the definitions, the methods, that is what is difficult. The reason that I opposed 271, and all but a handful, two or three rural legislators opposed 271 was because a method which was devised to arrive at the earning capacity was flawed. As we all know now, it was flawed. Going back a little bit to what Senator Chambers has said, this body, be it rural or urban, have a responsibility to treat everyone equitably. I believe it ought to be done that way, notwithstanding some of the admonitions and implications otherwise. Another reason I voted against LB 271 was because I said, if it is done the way you say it's going to be done, you will raise the values of the homes in the small communities in my district to the point where those individuals will not be able to afford to live in them. . .d that is a very real threat and one which we cannot afford to lose. I still contend, and I will always do so, that agricultural land, if viewed across the board and if contrasted with commercial property and contrasted with residential property on a case-by-case basis, is much closer to a equality than most people claim it is. We have disparity in every class of property. Agriculture does not have either the resources, the ability or the inclination, which ever you want to call it, to go out and research those inequities and bring them to the attention of the court and bring them to the attention of this Legislature and point out that those inequities do exist. Senator Landis says you can't put numbers in the Constitution. I don't like to put them in there. I don't like to put them in there, but I learned a lesson. Back in 1977, we passed a bill that removed the tax on personal property, thought we'd done something for agriculture. Thirty-five people signed the bill, many of them were urban legislators. The court said the formula for distribution is not equitable, cannot be done the way it was in the past, we'd have to tie it to something different. So what happened? The Revenue Committee devised a formula which sent \$12 million of money from the rural areas to the urban areas. A couple of rural legislators, who are no longer here, supported it. The rural dominated Legislature, a rural dominated Revenue Committee supported the bill coming out of the