to vote? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Debate is ceased. Senator Landis, Senator Johnson, who will be closing on the committee amendments? Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, the wide variety of factors that have been raised here, elevation, the length of growing seasons, how do you treat the case where there is a quick freeze of your crops at the end of the year, in response to all of those the question is it does appear in our formula. It is taken into account. It appears in the yield section. With respect to the quick freeze, that winds up being zero yield, and it gets cranked into the formula as zero yield. Hopefully, over the time the effects of flood, the effects of frost, the effects of acts of God will even out and the yield number will take into account these kinds of aberrations from one season to another. What you find is, when you ask the question is there a rational basis for these figures, the answer is, yes, there is, yes, you can take into account the effects of a rainfall, or elevation, or the cost of irrigation. You can do that because you are looking at expenses and you are looking at productivity. Those are hard data figures and they are being taken into account. The methodology of this bill is sound. With respect to the question of personal income, raised by Howard Lamb, you have to remember that personal income of farmers can, because of hog operations, or dairy operations, or livestock operations, none of which has to do with the return to land from agricultural crop production, the normal agricultural return to land is 3 or 4 percent a year of the value of the land. That is what it has been averaging recently. You will find our figures aren't too far off. You take those yield figures back to your farmers and ask them if they are wrong. I'll tell you we had a farmer come to us in the Revenue Committee and say, you know what, that yield figure is about right, you know what, that price figure is about right. You know what, that formula yields, it yields a higher number than what I've got now, but it is right, and I accept it. I accept it because I can find the hard figures that it bears down to. It does not, in the flawed sort of methodology that we have now with a tiny data base that doesn't take into account easily the distinctions that can be made out there between less than