

interrupt and ask a question, I would be glad to stop.

PRESIDENT: I think that their thought was that as you explain something it might be better to take it up right at that point. Now this is going to make a very lengthy explanation, but since time, we are not going to be cutting off on time on this maybe it would be all right. Senator Schmit, did you have a question? Senator Kremer said that he would entertain some questions along the way if it would make it more understandable.

SENATOR KREMER: Mr. Chairman, I would need to know at this point if I would have to be limited to the ten minutes. I understood that you would not.

PRESIDENT: No, I don't think that we could limit to ten minutes because we could not determine the time.

SENATOR KREMER: There is no way that you could explain the. . .

PRESIDENT: Nor can you determine the time. Senator Schmit, if you have a question. At this stage Senator Schmit, lets keep it to the questions, if you will. You know, without too lengthy a dissertation.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I would just like to make a comment. I would in some cases prefer to explain the bill in its entirety before we ask question but at the same time there may be more questions than I get asked in five minutes so I don't want to be limited on that end of it either. So it is whatever would be the best way to explain the bill and I think that we could perhaps, I'd just like to ask one question at the outset, then I think that I will limit my questioning until after you have completed it, if I could, Senator. First of all, Senator, I guess I had visited with Mr. Newberger about the penalty provisions and I think that this is a very major concern of mine that we strengthen this penalty section so severely, to my knowledge there has never been a fine rendered for a violation, and I guess the question that I have when I see three or four different areas here where each day is a separate violation and a separate fine and a Class IV misdemeanor, I can envision a landowner with a non-working meter and a valve that doesn't meet someone's approval, maybe being found in violation of two or three sections of this law. Before the item could be repaired he would be subject to a thousand or a fifteen hundred dollar per day penalty. I know that it is very easy to say, well, they will probably never ever levy it, but it has been the history of the government, I think, they usually take as much leeway as we give them, eventually, and usually the least able to defend himself is the one who is found to be the recipient of that kind of activity. I just wonder why the extreme emphasis upon changing the penalty section, Senator? And, whose idea it was.