

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...it may in fact, it may in fact need to be taxed at 150, 200 percent; if you own 1,000 acres, 300 percent; if you own 10,000 acres, 500 percent. All of a sudden, ladies and gentlemen, you confiscate property. I'm going to support the amendment. I believe it makes it a better bill, Senator Johnson, than it was before and I commend you for it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I have to ask a question on something that has been bothering me ever since I've read this bill. It's like you're reading a sentence and you're getting the sense of it, then a word pops up that can throw it onto a different track. So I have to ask Senator Johnson a question.

PRESIDENT: Senator Johnson, would you respond, please? Rod Johnson.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And, Senator Johnson, maybe this has been thoroughly explained and I've just missed it. But we say, and I'm on page 2, and I'm starting on line 22 where we're talking about for purpose of taxation, the Legislature added those two words, may provide for a different method of taxing which results in values which are not uniform. How can the method of taxing determine the value? Should the value be determined somehow and then the taxing be done? How can the method of taxing determine the value of the land?

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Senator, as I understand the language as it relates to that, it would allow this Legislature, not our county assessors or not the court, to basically come up with a method that determines the value, such as we have now with the earning stream capacity that we use now to create the values that we have for tax purposes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why don't they say provide for a different method of valuing agricultural land and horticultural land, which results in taxes which are not uniform and proportionate?