

if you could do it completely, frankly, and only you and I were talking, as good or terrible?

SENATOR DECAMP: Ah ha, you are going to put me in that category, huh? Let me explain it this way. Before Amendment 4 the bill had a lot of merit. It was a workable bill. Do you understand? With Amendment 4 you change the way of valuing agriculture land and, therefore, the original premise of the bill and the bill was introduced by Senator Eret at a time when Amendment 4 wasn't implemented and with the implementation now of Amendment 4 I am not sure how it would work. Therefore, therefore...

SPEAKER NICHOL: Yes.

SENATOR DECAMP: ...therefore, Senator Eret had a fabulous idea originally before Amendment 4, but I am not sure it will work today. Do you understand what I am saying?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I do, but I am trying to get you to say it so everybody else understands. Can I say what I think you are saying and then you correct me if I am wrong?

SENATOR DECAMP: Mmmmm.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I think, Senator DeCamp is saying that when a set of circumstances exists which justifies a measure and those circumstances no longer exist, the measure is no longer justified. Is that correct so far?

SENATOR DECAMP: That is pretty good.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if you have measures which no longer are justified and you go ahead and decide to put them into the law, that is not the best type of legislating that can be envisioned.

SENATOR DECAMP: Well, that certainly is a logical argument. Remember, this bill was put to the floor and was going before we did what we did on Amendment 4. It was conceived by Senator Eret back before Amendment 4 even passed, as I recall reading in the paper when they were having the farmland controversy and pricing and valuation and closing of banks, I think back David City days was when he first came up with the legislation. Is that right, Senator Eret? And the situation that existed then when farmland was