background on the sunset provision, I had my light on to talk on it, haven't had a chance yet. The sunset was intended, I don't think there was, at least I don't recall there being a representation made by the Appropriations Committee to the Judiciary Committee in the hearing about that the cost would go away. I think the cost will be there and as it's been indicated that the cost will be there on into the future. The reason the Judiciary Committee came in with the sunset clause was we said they are automating these things. If we're going to automate and at least the reason we've been given for it is that it is going to save money at some point in the future, that the courts should be required to come back in at some point in the future and justify where did those savings go, why do we still need the money, can the savings be used to offset some of this? That was the intent of the sunset. Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment to the amendment would make that coincide with the biennium so that the figures work out, give us a little better, more accurate picture of what is going on. It still accomplishes the goal I think and that is that we should at least know, the Appropriations Committee should hear and Judiciary Committee if that's whoever, or I guess this is an Appropriations Committee bill, that's who would hear about it just to justify what is happening in this area, is it generating some savings, where are those savings being applied, do we still need to have X number of dollars attached onto court costs? I have spoken with the court administrator about this. The court does...they don't like the sunset, but their indication is that it's not unreasonable to hold their feet to the fire to keep...have to come back in and justify what is going on. So like I said, while they don't...while they don't like the amendment, it's one that they, their position was that it is not unreasonable. With that I would urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. Discussion of the Bernard-Stevens amendment to the committee amendments. Senator Chambers, did you wish to discuss the Bernard-Stevens amendment?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, by adopting this amendment you give them an additional year to do that which I think is unjust and inappropriate, but I will not object to that amendment. Compromise, as I stated, makes people unhappy. I'm the only one unhappy about this amendment that Senator Bernard-Stevens is offering, but it's an attempt to get us past some of the peripheral issues and let us get to the