

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Warner.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Warner, you were correct when you said the constitution allows the Legislature to value agricultural and horticultural land differently from the way it does other property. That means the Legislature could value it at higher than 100 percent of fair market value. Isn't that true?

SENATOR WARNER: That was one of the arguments that was made at the time, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that still could be the case now, isn't that true? That can be done now.

SENATOR WARNER: It could be done different on other property. I...that argument is ade, I am not convinced that it is.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now if Senator Schrock's amendment were adopted, it could not be valued above 100 percent, could it?

SENATOR WARNER: It wouldn't make any difference, Senator. The issue that is not corrected by his amendment is that the assessed value, it does not have to be market value. The uniformity clause being already an...ag land already being an excepting to the uniformity clause, the assessed value could be different than the assessed value for the other classes of property and wipe out any effect of what the market value criteria was in the constitution.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And it's your belief that if Senator Schrock's amendment is adopted, that's what the Legislature would do to get back at or even with agriculture for adopting his amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Senator, no, Senator, what I am saying is if there was concern that the Legislature could do something to ag as it is now, they can do the same thing on the assessed value side. It doesn't preclude that from happening. I don't suggest the Legislature in the future would do that one way or the other. I am saying his amendment does not preclude the getting even, if that's the word.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And, realistically, Senator