

1 as to the language there. What has been stated by the
2 committee is that that language was considered modified
3 or explained by the colloquy which took place in the
4 Committee of the Whole which colloquy indicated that it was
5 intended by that phrase not to restrict the Legislature
6 solely to agricultural use but to any of the criteria which
7 had been mentioned and to overrule the case in the Court of
8 Appeals which held otherwise. So that the committee in
9 making the change has endeavored to give effect to the
10 phrase not merely as it was written but as it was ex-
11 plained.

12 Now this leaves open for the Convention on second
13 reading the question of whether it desires to go along with
14 that construction. It is clear that as it is intended now
15 it would give the General Assembly much broader authority
16 in defining the exemption of agricultural property. It
17 would not be limited to use.

18 Delegate Bamberger.

19 DELEGATE BAMBERGER: So that we can all be
20 assured of this, could either Delegate Penniman or the
21 Chair tell me if those pages of the transcript of that