

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator, Senator, Senator, my goodness sakes, you've been here long enough to know that, as Senator Rumery said many times ago, reason and common sense has very little basis often on the floor of the Legislature. And you have just answered the question affirmatively, whether it makes sense or not is in the eyes of the beholder. If, in fact, that I sell \$5 million worth of cattle off of a piece of land, or \$10 million worth of cattle off a piece of land, could very well be construed in the eyes of some individuals as making sense. The same thing is true, as I have said earlier, relative to the various types of crops, what it's used for, the \$2,500 claimer versus a \$50,000 horse, all of those things are factors which can be used. We have completely changed the method. There may be a saving grace in Senator Rod Johnson's amendment because he goes back to the value. But I am scared to death, Senator, of the land that says as...the language that says as defined by the Legislature, and then, secondly, may provide for a different method. We are doing something there which we may live to regret as Senator Conway has pointed out, and if we don't need any other indication, I think that your answer has just proven my point. And, if your livestock feeders have reason to be concerned now, they will have more reason, I'm afraid, to be concerned in future years.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, and especially Senator Johnson, I'm not trying to badger the bill. But I want some things in the record, and we've been discussing it over here under the balcony, and here's...I'm going to try to say it as clearly as I can what I'm seeing. By saying that the method of taxation results in the value which is not proportionate, the best way to try to get out there what I'm talking about is with an example. The value doesn't have to be proportionate to that of other land. So we take residential property and value it at 80 percent of its whatever, however we're going to determine it, market value or whatever, and agricultural land at 40 percent. Then we levy a tax on the residential property of 10 percent and levy a tax on the agricultural land of 150 percent. There are two...there are two concepts that have been put together here. Can the valuation, the value be disproportionate to other property and the amount or the rate of the tax levied? It ought to be clear what is being done. It doesn't matter, in one sense, if you say that