

many uses. We have irrigated land, we have dry land, we have rangeland, we have pastureland, and it goes on and on. So you can see it's a complicated issue. But at the present time, anyway, I'm going to vote against the Hall amendment and support the bill as it was amended by the committee amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hefner. Next speaker is Senator Schmit. Excuse me, excuse me, we do have an amendment to the amendment, offered by Senator Hall.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Hall would move to amend his own amendment. (Hall amendment, FA94, appears on page 1600 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment would change the 80 percent to 110 percent, that means that we would be able to classify, or excuse me, value the land as the voters voted on it, differently than other property. Who said it had to go down? Who said it had to go down? Why can't it go up? Why can't it go up to 110, maybe 150, maybe 180? Now I'm going to withdraw this amendment, so you can stop listening, if you want to, if you haven't already, but the point is this, ladies and gentlemen, who knows what the people voted on, except for the person who went to the booth. You can argue that...and probably the best explanation I heard was one that Senator Warner gave when we were discussing this, and he said, I think they voted that if they make money, they pay taxes, and if they don't make money, they don't pay taxes, that it was an income approach to property taxes, which makes a lot of sense, when you think about it, in terms of if I've got it, I'll pay it. But that's not the point. What they voted on was this, and what's in the Constitution and was passed was this, it says the Legislature may provide that agricultural land and horticultural land is defined by the Legislature, so it constitutes a separate and distinct class of property for purposes of taxation, and may provide for a different method of taxing agricultural land and horticultural land, which represents values that are not uniform and proportionate with all other tangible property and franchises, but results in values that are uniform and proportionate upon all property within the class of agricultural land and horticultural land. So as long as we value it all at 110 percent, we're within what the people voted on. That's not the question, ladies and gentlemen. The question is, is this an appropriate purpose? Is their rationale a reasonable rationale