

much on a national basis, I think probably the Attorney General has the right to not make this advice public if he chooses to do that even if we pass this amendment. And if this amendment is adopted before the bill goes much further, I will pursue that and share that research with you, but I personally do not believe this amendment would be binding on the Attorney General. Now that might be scary and it might not, but I think that's the case. Secondly, Senator Beutler I think made some comments which were extremely accurate and thoughtful about this process as far as having the Attorney General review it, what the purpose is and why we should keep it confidential. I, for one, do not want to put agencies in a position where they are afraid to even propose a rule or a regulation that they might think is in the public interest or for the sake of public welfare or safety or to prevent some danger for fear that they might be ridiculed if the Attorney General finds that it represents a taking. I don't want to chill the process and I won't support the bill if I feel that it does that because I think there is an absolute need for regulations. We live in a complex world, no question about it. My purpose for signing on to the bill and supporting the amendment that I did is because I think that people have gotten so fed up with waking up and finding that some regulation has been adopted that does affect their rights, particularly in some cases their property rights, but it isn't just property rights. It could be, certainly regulations can affect other rights, freedom of speech and the right to simply enjoy the space...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...in which you live and work. But in any event, having said that, I think that the better policy here is to support the confidentiality of the advice, give the Governor, give the agency a chance to reflect on what they're doing, and if they believe under their rights, police power rights, their rights on the constitution to protect the public from pollution or other life-threatening substances, that the regulation is needed, then they have the choice of going ahead with the regulation full knowing that there may be an argument made at some point by someone that it is a taking of property without just compensation, but at least they know that, at least they know that. And I think for that reason I would encourage you to defeat the Bernard-Stevens amendment and we can get on with the bill or other amendments to the bill. Thank you, Madam President.