

they need to build a road through it or something of that nature, that would probably be done anyway. But I do believe that we will find more people who will make use of the register if it is less restrictive, if they should so choose, to remove it from that register or if, in fact, it should change hands. Also I want to point out, there is no penalty in the bill so that in the event that an individual did choose to remove it or to use it in a different manner, there would be no penalty for it. It is just an acknowledgement of the fact that there ought to be some way for those of us who want to preserve a small portion of the native vegetation, native land the way it was, they can do so...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...in a very easy manner with no expense and no impediment and no altering of the value of the property. I can understand Senator Warner's concern and his deep commitment to the land and I think that that is an admirable and commendable, but as I said, those of us who want to put land under some kind of covenant could do so today and we would certainly not be prevented from doing it and we could make that sort of a covenant permanent. It would not also...it would, of course, be possible under this act to place a covenant on that property if you wanted to do so voluntarily and that would probably be, in my estimation, the preferable way to handle it. I would move for the adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, sir. Additional discussion, Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, again, as I understand the amendment, does not affect the individual's owner of the property to take it in or out, that's discretionary and that perhaps is all right. My concern rests from the fact that if someone chose to put a piece of ground in for the purpose of preserving it, which I assume is the long-term purpose, that it would be helpful, and I'm not going to object to attaching the amendment now, Senator Schmit, but perhaps there at least ought to be a process in taking it out where it is a governmental entity that is taking it which is what I think you indicated most of the time, that at least there is a process in place that puts some burden on the governmental entity to show why that piece of property should be changed from a conservancy type of being indicated...being held for a