

proportionate to others, then taxation becomes the cause, the value becomes the effect, and to me that doesn't make sense.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Schmit, please.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I hope that you will read what Senator Chambers just said. He put his finger on it, the word method. The method may be how many whooping cranes fly over the land, and how many of them land on the land. The method may be, as I said earlier, the distance from a city, the distance from the State Capitol, the distance from a four lane highway, all of those things may be utilized. I'm not going to talk about the bill anymore. I just want to say this, that if the body wishes, all of you know that amending a legislative resolution does not mean that it cannot be read on final today. Talked to the Clerk, it just has to go up for engrossing. And those of you who want to get it done today, you suspend the rules, I believe, get 30 votes, Mr. Clerk, and you can read the bill. So after it is readvanced, and I assume it will be, then if you want to do that, you just suspend the rules and you can read it on final today and we can rush into print with our victory.

PRESIDENT: Senator Conway, please.

SENATOR CONWAY: Mr. President, members, I rise to suggest that I will support LR 2, but would like to go on the record as firmly believing that this is an opportunity for some of the farm organizations to shoot themselves in the foot. I think Senator Schmit and Senator Chambers have both drafted some serious concerns that ought to be considered. As we look at the various methods by which we value property we use the income approach, the market approach, or some form of replacement cost. We've been using the market approach, three years ago I guess it's been now we were able to convert the income approach. The agricultural community was somewhat excited about this approach, and as you all know how the question had been framed, the Supreme Court has ruled that out of line, and so, therefore, this whole thing has come about simply out of the agricultural communities' obsession with returning to or having an income approach in the assumption that the income approach, by virtue of the way that it's calculated and by virtue of the way that agricultural land is viewed, is probably going to let them off the hook a little bit cheaper than they would be under a pure market approach, because we also know in agricultural land that