

all it does. It is nothing more than a very straightforward approach that says you voted on it, you said you wanted to treat ag land in a preferential way, then let's go about setting that up by saying we're going to determine market value, which is a standard by which every other form of property is valued and levied against, and let's just reduce that by 20 percent. Let's build it right into the statutes and say, here is what we want to do. Because, in effect, that's what you do with 320. You do take in and you do argue the whole issue of income. One could argue that on commercial property, as Senator Landis said that commercial property is valued at the highest level in terms of being the closest to 100 percent of market of any property class that we have in the state. One could argue that there are types of commercial property that don't produce any income, and that very likely that is what will happen should this be challenged. It won't be the difference between the homeowner and the farmer, in terms of what it costs to send the various kids to school, because the homeowner doesn't generate any income off of his lot that his house happens to sit on. But the commercial property owner does use that property, that building, in most cases, to generate income. And they could argue that they then, too, should be allowed to use a basis that is derived not only from market but from income as well to receive the benefits of the formula that is allowed for in LB 320. It won't be the homeowner, I don't think, that is going to challenge this. It hasn't been the homeowner in the past on personal property that has given us, I think, some insight as to where the court has been and where the court is going on these issues. I just don't believe yet that even with the way the bill is currently sitting, and again I recognize that it's in the best form it probably can be, taking into consideration the market aspect that there won't be...the potential is there, let's put it that way, the potential is there for this to be challenged, too. Anything can be challenged. But I don't think it's going to stop here. When you have a provision that is built in at 80 percent, and you have a uniformity clause, and you don't have anything, and although amendment one is drafted better than amendment four, I guess, in terms of being tighter, you still have to have that sound, reasonable and rational basis on which to make the determination that you're going to treat one type of property, one class of property different than another. The people voted on it. I guess that...and it's in the Constitution in that we're, going to treat agricultural land different. We also have the uniformity clause in there. We also have the whole issue of anti special legislation that's in the