

amount, would be almost nothing. But the \$5 million would be merely between farmers or individuals within the counties that have breeding herds. And so that wouldn't affect some of the more urban counties very much at all. And it's just a fairness issue between farmers actually because, as has been pointed out, one farmer or rancher gets by without any tax on his property tax on his breeding herd, another one does have the tax because of this bill and so we just firmly believe that the money is not a big amount when you spread it out. But to those few individuals that are affected it is a big amount. So that's why, for the sake of fairness, this should be done.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Lamb. Senator Schmit, followed by Senators Hall, Wickersham, Hefner and Coordsen.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam President and members, we do not have the time in the five-minute period to go back and review the chain of events that brought us to the point where we are at today. And I do not have many chances to say, I told you so and I know there will be those who say if we had not passed Amendment 1 that it would have "all gone back on". Senator Warner points out that if we had not done something because the passage of an amendment of 829 in '91 it was, in fact, all back on in '92. The problem is, gentlemen and ladies, that you don't like to concede that you made a mistake, that, in effect, you were snookered way long back a long ways back. You should never have voted for 829 because it, in effect, put the tax back on unless you worked something out in the meantime. And we had lost our bargaining power at that time so it was inevitable for the chain of events to occur in '92 that took place. Now some of you think that we are in a very bad situation now because of the fertilizer tax. Yet I well recall rural members standing on this floor and saying, we can live with the tax on fertilizer. The folks behind the glass, whom I call the traitors to agriculture, said, we can live with the tax on fertilizer. What they didn't recognize and were so foolish as not to acknowledge or to reveal to those of you who didn't know any better was that once you begin a tax on an agricultural input where do you stop and why should you stop. If it's fair to tax fertilizer, why not energy, why not seed corn, why not chemicals, why not pharmaceuticals? There is no reason to stop. You might just as well continue. I want...if you think this is bad news, ladies and gentlemen, and I would support the amendment by Senator Owen Elmer, but if you think this is bad news, I want to ask Senator Hall a question because if you think you've got it bad now, you