

1 retention of this language in the Constitution. The
2 State Board of Agriculture passed a resolution, your
3 present deponent saying naught at that particular time
4 because I didn't want to be charged with wearing too
5 many hats in this situation; by a vote of 10 to nothing
6 or 9 to nothing, the State Board of Agriculture strongly
7 recommended the retention of this particular language.
8 On the other side of the coin, the State tax administra-
9 tors, while believing that farm assessments, bona fide
10 farm assessments should get the benefit of a lower
11 valuation, felt, however, that the completely subjective
12 test that is found in Article 43 should not be permitted
13 to stand, and its rigidity should be replaced by a more
14 flexible test that would permit the Legislature to
15 classify land for agricultural use, and assessments could
16 be made accordingly.

17 The Committee accepted this, sort of a middle
18 ground. They did not eliminate, or does not recommend
19 the elimination from the Constitution of a specific
20 direction toward this problem, and I think this was done
21 primarily because, well, for two reasons. One is, I