

PRESIDENT: Senator Baack, please.

SENATOR BAACK: Right. This is simply another clarification amendment that says that if a person is...the way it reads right now it just talks about a person being displaced and this clears it up to say that as the result of a publicly financed project, because that's what this whole bill deals with. And so it's just a clarifying amendment.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion? If not, the question is the adoption of the Baack amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of Senator Baack's amendment, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The Baack amendment is adopted.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to amend the bill. (The Chambers amendment appears on page 696 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I talked over this very apparently insignificant amendment with Senator Baack and he has no problem with it. It would be on page 4, line 25, the current language indicates that if a person is displaced and would be relocated, it would be to a place generally not less desirable. I'm striking the word "generally" so that there won't be an ambiguity. If there is to be a discussion, it should be simply over whether the relocated person has been placed in a new location that is less desirable or not, and not have an argument over what the word "generally" means. And Senator Baack has no objection to this, so it would strike that word "generally".

PRESIDENT: All right, thank you. The question is the adoption of the Chambers amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. I need a little help, please. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of Senator Chambers' amendment.