

assessment practices, talks about all kinds of other things out there, gets back to that very same point, it becomes clear as a bell. It must have been that course in algebra that I didn't do so well in, in high school. The fact of the matter is, ladies and gentlemen, it is the difference between being very up front with what we are doing here, what the intent was to do, what the intent has always been to do, and that is to treat ag land a little differently, very much a preferential approach which is fine. But let's do it in a very straightforward manner. One would believe that there is nobody here that knows what the farm down the road sold for, or what their property is worth right now. One would believe that nobody here, not even us city folk, would have a clue as to what ag land sells for by reading the local want ads. One would believe that ag land, if it has no income, has no value. Interesting approach. Anyway, you are going to get to 80 percent of market either way. You either go through the approach that has been offered by Senator Landis that winds you through canyons, up and down hills, over formulas and through manuals and you get to the same spot as this amendment that does nothing more than says 80 percent of market, and you come to the same end result. I think that it is a much clearer approach. It is much easier to deal with. I am glad to hear that the Department of Revenue thinks otherwise, that it is a novel idea on their part, but in any case, it does not impugn what the intent is of the bill. In no way shape or form does it change the amount that you are going to pay on your property. No way does it do that. All it does is say let's take it very much up front, call it what it is, so I guess we can go back to our constituents and say, yes, we did exactly what you intended us to do when you adopted the constitutional amendment in the election. But I have got a funny feeling that this is not going to be adopted, and what we are probably going to go back and tell our constituents is, no, we value agricultural land on income, even though we get back to 80 percent of market, and we struggle like heck to do that so we can make it constitutionally sound, if it is even at that. With that, I would urge adoption of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that we have a call of the house.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** We have a request for the house to go under call. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 27 ayes, 0 nays to go under call.