

with the garbage in the wreckage.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I don't like to do that. I have never done it. But the temptation, ladies and gentlemen, is strong. We are here at 9:07 on a Friday night when we have serious work to do, each and every one of us have pulled amendments that were important to us on various bills because of the constraints of time and we are wasting time on a bill which was only introduced as a self-defense measure and which, when it was suggested that it wasn't needed, ought to have been indefinitely postponed or struck...the enacting clause ought to have been stricken like that, and we are hustling around with it. Ladies and gentlemen, I suggest you strike the enacting clause and get on with the business of this Legislature at this late hour.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Obviously, this will be the last issue handled this evening before going to Final Reading. There is discussion on the motion. Senators Scofield and Morrissey, your lights are on. Senator Scofield.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Mr. President and members, I don't want to drag this out because we have lots of work to do, but I don't want to just sit here and have this be construed as somehow, somehow of harassing this bill, because it isn't. It is simply a way that I thought was a reasonable way to propose to avoid any costs being incurred, first by the General Fund, which Senator Schmit is telling us won't happen and won't be necessary, but I still think that that could happen. It's happened before. I've sat on the Appropriations Committee now for long enough to know that every once in awhile an issue comes back that was unforeseen, sometimes deliberately and sometimes not deliberately, but nevertheless it shows up, and the amendment was simply to try to cover IANR, frankly, in the event that that happens because it apparently isn't clear at all what is and isn't, based on both Senator Schmit's letter and Mr. Wigley's letter here that you have right in front of you. And so it's getting a little late, Senator Schmit, and you're getting a little testy about this, but it's certainly not intended as any kind of attempt to attack this particular bill and doesn't have anything to do with who's leading what here. It has to do with some...what I think is a reasonable attempt to try to protect both IANR and to make sure that the appropriate parties pay for any costs should they be incurred. Obviously,