

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...lost.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Madam President and members, I don't know what to do on this. To say I was an easy vote, to say it was a tough vote are both understatements, but I did decide to go and I guess the deciding vote for me was one sentence Senator Warner said, and that was either way they can do it to us someday, I am paraphrasing a little bit, simply by lowering the value of residential or commercial or whatever, if that happens, and leave ag where it is. So even though it is in the constitution, and I wanted to lock it in the constitution, perhaps there is another day that it will be different. It might even be better. I tried hard for the income-producing method that Senator Landis had, that's true. It failed. I don't know why, that the Supreme Court wouldn't uphold that, I guess, because of the market value issue. I just wanted to say if you take a loan on ag land, for those of you that don't know, you only get a loan on about 50 to 60 percent in most areas. That's what's considered it's income value. The other 40 percent is what you might call blue sky or otherwise, but ought to prove the point that ag land is overprices and it's bought for a million reasons, which I won't go into, but a lot of it has nothing to do with the income-producing ability. It has to do with the need to survive in agriculture and you buy land that is way over your head simply to have something left to farm. But be that as it may, I don't want to jeopardize this property tax package, and I don't know that it will have jeopardized it. I am not sure because we have 80 percent in the statutes, but that is another issue. We still have 80 percent. It isn't like we took 80 percent out of the statutes. We have just exactly right now what we had at two o'clock before we went into this debate, and I don't necessarily see, in the foreseeable future, that that will change. And if it does, the horses will be here, that is votes, regardless of how we did it in this constitutional amendment. And if there is a risk at putting the constitutional amendment to jeopardize this whole package that everyone is giving a little bit to get to, to try to at least do something about the property tax issue, and I will predict a year from now we will be in this bloody, bloody fight trying to make some improvement on what we've done this