

SENATOR HALL: I would have no objection. I just raised the only problem I see with the addition of the two words, being that it has potential to narrow the scope, which may very well be your intent. But I don't have any objection to the language, because I view it as I guess just a clarification.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Hall. And, members of the Legislature, my intent is to narrow it so that the kind of thing that I mentioned, which I had talked about as being possible under the amendment, would not happen. When you talk about taxation, it's clear, throughout the history of taxing, from the beginning of time when taxes were levied, that nobody wants to pay them. So if at the time we propose a constitutional amendment, part of the means by which that amendment will be interpreted will come from the debate on the floor of the Legislature when we adopt certain provisions. So, if I make the offering of this motion, give the reasons that I have for offering it, and nobody can deny that what I say is a possibility, and the Legislature rejects that amendment, then the conclusion would be that the Legislature is willing to allow land which is partially used for agricultural purposes, but the vast majority of income derived from that land comes from some other purpose, the value has to be based on that land as used for agricultural and horticultural purposes. So if the intent is to allow a different use in conjunction with the agricultural and horticultural use, and that other use produces far more income, but you want to restrict, for taxing purposes, the value of the land to that portion used for agricultural and horticultural, then that's what the vote will do. There will be a rejection of the amendment. So I'm going to listen to the discussion and see where it carries us. Senator Hall, did you have anything else you'd like to add?

SENATOR HALL: Yes, thank you, Senator Chambers. The...if you look up, back on page 2 of the committee amendments, and you go to subsection (a), we were dealing with subsection (b) of Section 2, the Legislature does have the ability to define agricultural and horticultural land. So I don't know that your amendment would affect, I'm trying to think this through, and I'd have to go look at the definition in statute, but I don't know that your amendment would be all that onerous to this amendment, although the language that you're amending is language that is currently in the Constitution. So that's just for the record.