

to bid on others. So we think there needs to at least be a floor of the appraised valuation in here and that is why I am offering this amendment. It did not get included in the drafting of committee amendments simply because of the process we use but we did discuss it in the committee. And I would also say and then not turn my light on again, again talking in a technical sense, most people are discussing, using their opportunities to discuss the Lamb amendment to discuss the bill itself. Just back from the committee point of view, I don't think anything that Senator Lamb is doing with this amendment in any way makes the bill less advantageous. It probably improves the bill so I would suggest whether you agree with or disagree with Senator Lamb's bill that probably adopting this amendment to his amendment and then his amendment to the bill does, in fact, make good sense and which at that time I hope will have my mind made up more firmly on the merits of the legislation and be able to speak to the merits of the legislation itself, but my amendment right now is to add the provision that the land could not be sold for less than appraised value.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Withem. I'll now recognize senators wishing to address the amendment to the amendment. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam President, I would support the Withem amendment to the Lamb amendment. I think it is important as he has explained that there be protections placed in the statutes so that the land does not, in effect, become a victim of a fire sale. There are some concerns on the part of individuals as has been identified both by himself and Senator Lamb that this could happen. I think it's also important to remember that land prices move up and down. We talk about how the appraisals are arrived at. Appraisals are, of course, a matter of an ongoing fact of life. They need to have these appraisals all the time in order to know just what kind of rentals to charge. I'd like to give you a little bit of history on this if I may do so because I may not get another opportunity to speak upon it. I'm a long-time proponent of the sale of school lands because I recall in the early 1970s the rental of the school lands was almost a disgrace when we viewed it from the standpoint of returns. I want to point out that it was not the Board of Lands and Funds that came to the Legislature and decided that something needed to be done with the rental values of the school lands. It was this Legislature, the '71 and '72 Legislature, and believe it or not, the bill came to the Ag Committee and I