

they're going to do. And, quite honestly, when I look at it there was another alternative, we did not have to go this particular route. And I think we look kind of silly, to be honest with you, putting out a policy that we know may violate the Constitution, excuse me, the 4-R Act, we know may cause problems, but for political convenience, and it was, it was so nice to be able to take those companies and those corporations that had most to do with it and hit them a little harder. It was fun to do. But because of that now we may jeopardize, in my opinion, the whole concept. I agree with Senator Moore, I think it's poor policy, it doesn't have to be done. There are other ways to do it, and because of that I'm not willing to...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: ...take that particular risk, because there are other options available. I will be voting no on 829.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. The speaking order is Senator Lamb, Senator Abboud, Senator Robak, Senator Bernard-Stevens, Senator Horgan, Senator Beutler, Senator Hall, Senator Will, Senator Schmit. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise to oppose whatever we're talking about, and I'm not sure what we're talking about (laughter), because I don't know what Senator Kristensen really has in mind. But I really have a question of Senator Kristensen, if he'd yield.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR LAMB: You mentioned, Senator Kristensen, that a number of people, including the Revenue Committee, worked very hard this year on this problem, and I agree. But I don't recall you bringing forth a solution, similar to something, or an 829, or have I forgotten about it?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: No, I think you're right, Senator Lamb, and...

SENATOR LAMB: Okay, thank you very much.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay. (Laughter.)

SENATOR LAMB: Here we are, okay, here we are on the 89th day,