

the court? I mean, one can argue that on this proposed definition I guess, what's a cabin trailer? Who knows what a cabin trailer is, and I guess I would oppose putting a definition of real property and leave the...this is stretching for me, but leave the discretion to the court with regard to what their interpretation would be on a case by case basis as it deals with real property. I think the issue of placing a definition in the Constitution comes way too close to the whole concept of Initiative 300 in defining what a family farm is, I guess, and what can and cannot be included in a farming operation as it relates to whether it should be a corporate entity or a privately held entity, what can and cannot be raised. There's a whole number of problems that we run into when we attempt to limit and at times it's like anything else, we just don't catch everything in the net that we throw out. I just...I have a problem with the issue of placing, excuse me, placing in the Constitution a definition that is then only changed by another constitutional amendment. The issue that Senator Conway raises with regard to whether or not there should be legislative authority, I think would probably be a more appropriate route to go. It would be a little more difficult to argue against that amendment, probably would attempt to anyway, but the issue here I think, although it does have some merit in that it, I guess, would limit the definition of real property so that you would at least be only, I guess, able to define it within the framework as presented in this amendment. I see that as a problem because there may be things that currently or in the future we would determine to be real property, but yet do not meet this definition and you would then have to open the Constitution back up to allow for that in order to have them treat it in the same manner. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the body to reject Senator Conway's amendment although it does make for good discussion.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Kristensen, on the Conway amendment.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I originally had my light on to speak to the constitutional amendment itself, and I may give part of that beginning. I don't know that the Legislature understands how critical this sort of a debate may be, and so many things may be said for the record, but this is not a piece of legislation, this is not another bill. This is actually changing the entire blue print of how we operate in this state. The Constitution itself is