

it out on the floor last year, that it was put out, I think, on a six to one vote. But I guess I have to say that I'm not sure still that I understand all the ramifications of this bill and that worries me. And I guess in looking at the committee statement this year there were a number of people who came in and did testify against the bill, Senator Jones, mostly people, not entirely, but people associated with environmental issues. And I remember there were some arguments about environmental regulations and so forth at the committee hearing last year. And I'm wondering could you just briefly tell us what the main arguments...can you remember what the main arguments were that they gave?

SENATOR JONES: Well there was several of them, but I think some of the main arguments was that they were afraid that they might have to pay a compensation for some, you know, endangered species or something on a river that they had to cut off or something. And just like...I think the tern, two little birds, you know, that are along the Platte, that if they would require them to not farm too close to it, that would be a taking, see, of the ground because it could only raise half as much as it could before. I think that was the argument that was a year ago, but that didn't come up this year on that one.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Could you explain in your own words what you think the main intent of this bill is.

SENATOR JONES: The main intent for this bill is for the...to kind of force the government to consider regulations carefully before restricting land usage asking the taxpayers to pay for it, see. And I think the main thing is that we want to consider here, it might curb some court cases against our...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: It might what?

SENATOR JONES: It might curb some court cases against our state, see, and could cost the state a lot of money.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: It might curb some court cases?

SENATOR JONES: Yeah, yeah, if they realize that there was a taking.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: You mean prevent some court cases?