

of the people voting by a majority to adopt it. We'll put it out there for a vote, it will be rejected, and we'll be right back here again. What I'm trying to do is raise the kind of issues that can be raised when you present this to the public. Why put into the statute...I mean into the Constitution, which then could not be altered by statute, that all you have to do is actively use the land for agricultural purposes. No percentage, no modifying term, like primary, nothing, just actively use it. There is another question I would like to ask Senator Hall, because Senator Schmit said this is the first issue I've raised, but I have others. Senator Hall, is there anything that specifically authorizes the taxing of intangible?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Hall.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...intangibles, in this amendment, this proposed constitutional amendment?

SENATOR HALL: That authorizes the taxing?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR HALL: No, but there is nothing that prohibits it.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, if this amendment is adopted, although we've set up certain categories that can be exempted and taxed, intangibles would still be open for taxation as the Legislature saw fit.

SENATOR HALL: As they currently are.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, so that's not changed. Going back to what I'm talking about here, could the Legislature establish limitations on what types of zoning county boards and cities could do?

SENATOR HALL: Sure.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Can the Legislature establish a definition of agricultural and horticultural which cannot be overridden by an enactment by a county board or city council?

SENATOR HALL: As that's what the 320 type proposals have done.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Can the Legislature describe as agricultural