

agricultural or horticultural activities, because we're not talking about culling or any of those things. It would not be valued for agricultural and horticultural purposes, but for what ever other purposes those activities were determined to be.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Then I have also had an opportunity to lease it to a trail riding group, a saddle club and some other people. That, I assume, would meet your same objection, is that right?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, but if that...you might not make much money from that, so you might get a lower tax rate by having it classified as that than the agricultural and horticultural. So, here's what I'm saying, Senator Schmit, I don't think every other use would naturally cause it to have a higher taxable value. The ones I want to focus on are the higher taxable values that could result.

SENATOR SCHMIT: But the purpose, of course, for me to make it available to someone would be to increase the income from the property. By so doing, if I did increase the income from the property, would it not then increase the value of the property?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schmit, with this preference for agricultural and horticultural...By the way, you haven't heard me say much publicly because we didn't have anything before us, we had all of this mishmash of various things. And I had said I don't have a comment until I see where we're going, and then I might disagree with that. But there would be two ways to look at the property, as agricultural and horticultural, that's method number A, which is given preferential treatment. Activity B would be for the purpose of increasing the income from the land, and that particular method may not be given preferential treatment. Under the amendment that I'm offering, even though the land is actively used, to some extent, for the agricultural and horticultural and entitled to the preferential treatment, the second method would not be, therefore, you could not get the preferential treatment for that land. And I'm answering like that to try and be as complete as I can in the response.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Thank you, Senator Chambers. I do agree that we didn't have anything specific before us, but we have had a multitude of proposals from a variety of sources, and this is, of course, the most recent.