

opposition. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body, I would like to follow up with what Senator Will was speaking about. And I guess I should say I voted to adjourn sine die because I knew the Revenue Committee Chairman was coming up with another amendment and I kind of bought on to Senator Will's arguments. But I guess I would like to ask a few other people in this Legislature to respond to what Senator Will has just said. And I would like to start with a few of the people with legal training. Senator Chambers, I would like to ask you to respond, if you would.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schimek, I concur with what Senator Will said.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you. Is Senator Beutler here? Senator Kristensen, would you respond, please.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: In general, Senator Schimek, I think what Senator Will talks about is a true concept. I think that is a concept that the court has always looked at. I just called my staff and I'm going to pull that ag land value case that he's talked about because I haven't looked at it in about five or six months. But I, in general terms, I think that it's a very real possibility. I don't think it's black and white like maybe Senator Chambers would state to you there but I think it's a very real possibility.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Senator Lindsay, you were out of the room. Did you hear the discussion? And could you respond to Senator Will's concern?

SENATOR LINDSAY: I rarely listen to Senator Will but I was...I caught it that time. I...my thought is, I guess, I agree with Senator Kristensen, it's not black and white there. I think the language that Senator Hall has in there is awfully strong. I think it's very extremely difficult for the Supreme Court to overlook language. They've done it before but I think it would be unlikely in this case.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you very much. I guess I...I'm not 100 percent sure I'm going to vote against this but I will be