

recognized by the Legislature. Thank you for visiting us today. Senator Warner, please, followed by Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Bernard-Stevens, please.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Question.

PRESIDENT: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner, would you like to close on your amendment to the Schmit amendment, please. Just a moment please. (Gavel.) Please, let's hold it down so we can hear the speakers. Thank you. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, we have spent a lot of time on this one issue but perhaps it helped also to develop an understanding of the issue itself. It seems to me that the arguments I have heard in opposition have been a couple, one of which is that if this amendment is adopted that it would be vetoed. Now I don't know where that rumor started. I am, frankly, beginning to get a bit suspicious that there is some lobby group promoting this bill that is trying to use the veto threat rather than fact, because the administration...and I said it before lunch, the administration has not said anything to me differently than what they told me this morning and what they told me this morning was they had a concern about the bill, the amendment, because of cost and they did not yet know what they were going to do. I had it reaffirmed later and that was the same answer and I think this business about the veto to this amendment and the bill has its roots somewhere else than in the administration. Secondly, there is another time line here that you're putting a few people in a whale of a predicament. I suspect that any place that has some contamination that is now known, they're prohibited from qualifying if this amendment is not adopted. They, obviously, could not get insurance or a bond, while they had contamination, for the future and they perhaps can't afford to pay to have it cleaned up. I don't know where those people are going to end up but they are being put in an almost untenable position. True, one could argue that those who have already spent money for cleanup are entitled to some consideration but, at least, they