

like to hear about it.

SENATOR JONES: On the state level there's nothing that I know of that happened for sure.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, so if our current processes are working all right and if the current law is properly framed so that he has to do this review, under current law, why do we need this bill at all?

SENATOR JONES: Well, there's 13 other states that have passed it, and I can give you examples in some other states where it was a taking, and that's the reason that I wanted to try to get this passed in Nebraska.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, thank you, Senator. I guess I'm very concerned about a process that takes the whole takings law and seems to try to switch the forum from the court system, where it properly belongs, to some kind of situation where there is interplay, some kind of political interplay between a Governor and an Attorney General. I mean it seems to me in the first instance that so many of the factors that you look at, when you look at takings law, depend on the facts of a particular situation, that is, for example, how much of the economic value of the property was taken? Well, you know that's a fact question that varies with each different situation that may exist and which really has to be addressed in the court system. Now I don't have any objection to the current law the way it is, I think there needs to be review of all constitutional provisions, but why we would specify one and elevate just compensation above some other areas that the Attorney General should be reviewing, like freedom of speech, freedom of religion, he should be checking for all those constitutional provisions. And I have a hard time figuring out why we should be focusing on one and elevating it...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...in his attention above all others. I have some additional questions, but time for those later, I guess. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Chambers, to speak to the Bromm amendment.