

we can do. To date, the States of Louisiana and Arkansas and Oklahoma have all enacted the same provisions that we enacted last year. The State of Kansas has not. The State of Kansas, as I understand it, is in the process of attempting to do that. It's highly doubtful that they will get that done this year. There is the probability that they will get it done next year. In any event, it seems to me that we need to say to the State of Kansas, in as polite a way as we can, but in as firm a way as we can, that we expect them to truly share liability, and that we expect them to indicate that by passing those provisions which we suggested last year, which all other states, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, and Louisiana, have, I assume, by assenting to those provisions, indicated that they are reasonable in nature. So that is basically what this does. It, obviously, is not what Senator Dierks wants, but it is something that will do something positive towards the situation. This is not the last year that Senator Dierks can come to us for community consent statutes. That can be done next year. The licensing will not be complete by this time next year I am sure. So that is always there if events take a turn that would indicate to us that we should not proceed with this matter. If you proceed with LB 72 now, as it is written, sure enough, the vote will be taken quickly and we will be in a crisis situation before many months have passed. So I suggest to you as an alternative, a milder provision, a progressive provision, not everything Senator Dierks wants, by any means at this point in time, but something that acknowledges that this Legislature is still paying very strict attention to the situation. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Mr. Clerk, an amendment to the amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Dierks would move to amend Senator Beutler's amendment by striking lines 1 and 2.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, the amendment that Senator Beutler brings is I think a worthy amendment, the actual new wording, and it does kind of put the feet to the fire for Kansas because they have been holding up on this shared liability legislation, and I think that this would help to stimulate some interest on their part. The problem I have with the amendment as it was introduced is that it strikes the whole of 72. It removes community consent, and that is