

anticipated on my part because I have been so wrought up about the property tax package and I am relieved, frankly, that what's happened has happened because I get to vote against this whole enterprise now, which...which rested on an assumption which made me very nervous, and that was the ability to come up with \$200 million of replacement funds. It has allowed me, on the other hand, to entertain the notion of lids, which normally I don't do. It's allowed me to think about cutting back on levy limits, something that I don't normally do, and I have been part of a joint enterprise, I am a member of the Revenue Committee, and the committee has been given the responsibility to come up with a package, and even though I have had, you know, problems and concerns and fears, I have reversed longstanding historical trends of my voting pattern to support the package. I did it because it's felt as if the Legislature has been called upon to do this, and the Legislature, in turn, had called upon the Revenue Committee to find a way that the eight of us could live with a package, and we had achieved that balance. But part of the whole rationale for me to do that was to keep certain kinds of things out of the constitution. In fact, Senator Bernard-Stevens, it is true that the public supports an assistance for agriculture in evaluation, but they never supported 80 percent. What they supported was an income-based valuation on the theory that it would be 100 percent of the income-based mechanism, but the income-based mechanism would be a different and yet fair standard. They didn't vote for the 80 percent number. We have and we've kept that. That's all right and, as a matter of fact, I supported that bill and the original bill was mine. The 80 percent number is my bill. It is not even an agriculture senator's bill. It is my bill, but I don't ask that it be placed in the constitution. One of the things I've tried to do is to hew to the goal of keeping certain kinds of things out of the constitution, among them numbers, among them the kinds of things which limit our flexibility to respond to new and different conditions. But, frankly, the Schrock amendment's success means that all bets are off for me, and, in fact, I get to go back to voting my historical pattern, which is to oppose lids, which is to oppose levy limits, which is to give local political subdivisions the freedom to do what they will, and the fate that they have, whether that means the failed bond elections that occur, or the number of recall elections that have occurred successfully around the state, that they live and die with their own fate. The bets are off and I, frankly, am somewhat relieved. I am going to vote to