

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But that doesn't mean, Senator Hall, that I like the current language, because some of those amendments that were offered to give preferential treatment I have not supported.

SENATOR HALL: And as....Neither have I.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR HALL: So I didn't mean to imply that I agreed with it either, I was just telling you that it is current language, for the record.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if I have time, I'd like to ask Senator Hall another question. And, Senator Hall, I am trying to establish a record, because there could be a challenge to this amendment, even though it's put in the State Constitution. When you referred me to the language on page 2 of the committee amendment, you mentioned the power of the Legislature to define, and I looked at that and marked it. Do you think by putting this in the Constitution it means that we can use an unnatural, arbitrary, unusual definition, which is contrary to what would ordinarily be understood by these terms when we enact a statute?

SENATOR HALL: No, but we could very likely, Senator Chambers, well, we could until it was challenged. But not once the court took a look at it, I would guess, no, that it would have to be some terminology that would be in reference to what it is defining. And it would have to have a rational basis from which you used that definition.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: My final comment, for anybody who would address this amendment either for or against, I want your thinking about what impact putting the word "exclusively" would add in taking away from what the intent of this amendment is, or whether not putting "exclusively" in will allow a much broader interpretation of what kind of land can be restricted for tax purposes to agricultural and horticultural value.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Hall, your