

reconsider, but I expect it to fail. I expect it not to get 25 votes, and since the burden will be on this bill to get 30 votes, it had a lot of votes coming out of General File, it may still have those, but at least it won't have to have mine anymore, and I can go back to voting the way I've always done. I have done the business of the committee on behalf of the Legislature because I thought that was the message from the body, but if that's not the message of the body and the body here is really turning on itself to make games by one sector over another, then that...that bond is released and, frankly...

SENATOR COORDSEN: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...I'm breathing some of my first very comfortable breaths of this session in contemplation that the Schrock amendment will not be reconsidered, even though I will vote that way, and that I'll get to vote against pieces of legislation, which, historically, contradict my longstanding beliefs. I kind of feel vaguely good about the whole thing.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Jesus, one time, was talking about people who had done the right thing, then turned around and done the wrong thing, and he said it was like a dog returning to its vomit. I think what we need to look at is the suggestion that a correction needs to be made here by voting for this reconsideration motion. To say that a correction needs to be made is to suggest that an error was committed. I don't think an error was committed when we adopted Senator Schrock's amendment. There was lengthy discussion. We all knew what it was we were voting for, and, Senator Landis, you had mentioned an historical pattern of voting. I have supported ag issues ever since I have been in the Legislature. There are times that I have had petitions brought to me from the agricultural sector of the state saying that...that these are from people, they felt I looked out for their interest more than the senators from their area. So as far as trying to establish credentials, I don't think it's really necessary for that to be done, but I just wanted to point that in...that out. If there is so much objection to putting the 80 percent limit on the value for ag property, then I am wondering if there is an intent on the part of some of these people who said they supported in statute to make a statutory change and reduce that amount. If