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conflict with other general laws of the state, and (3) it must not be an unreasonable or arbitrary enactment.\textsuperscript{4}

With respect to the first restriction, Idaho courts have held that Article 12, § 2 prohibits a county from making its police regulations effective within a municipality.\textsuperscript{5} For purposes of the determination it is irrelevant that the ordinance in question is not in conflict with any existing ordinance of a municipality because “[t]he question is one of power and not one of conflict.”\textsuperscript{6}

The second restriction enunciates the familiar rule that local ordinances may not conflict with general laws. The Idaho courts include within the category of “conflict” that which is usually referred to as field preemption. Conflict between state and local regulation may be implied where, despite lack of specific language preempting regulation by local government entities, the State has acted in an area in such a pervasive manner that it must be assumed that it intended to occupy the entire field of regulation.\textsuperscript{7} The Idaho Supreme Court has not defined “general” in a way that might limit the preemptive scope of a state law. Thus, it appears that any matter on which the state legislature sees fit to legislate may potentially preempt a local enactment.\textsuperscript{8}

With respect to the third condition – that a local enactment not be unreasonable or arbitrary – there is no case law.

In sum, Idaho’s local government regime might be categorized as “Dillon’s Rule plus.” Dillon’s Rule remains the conceptual framework, but the constitution and legislature grant the police power on top of this foundation.