

had statutory authority, or whether or not they are constitutional have a longer period of time for examination. So this is not intended to be a cutoff, it is intended to provide a public forum for those who might be interested parties to express their concerns and to cause a full evaluation of a proposed rule or regulation.

SENATOR CROSBY PRESIDING

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I'm opposed to the Jones-Wickersham amendment. And before I go into all of my reasons and pose a few questions to the cointroducers of this amendment, I would look at the language that we have. On page 1 of their amendment we see, starting in line 19, with subsection (c), a description but not necessarily a quantification of the fiscal impact on state agencies, political subdivisions and persons being regulated and so forth. That is existing language. The new language talks about an analysis which is not...that word is not found with reference to any other rule or any other process of rule-making, but we're talking about an analysis of any potential taking of property. Potential is one of those words which includes everything and touches nothing. Anything that could happen falls under the term potential. And by opening it so broadly the only way a rule could be considered to have been properly framed is to sit down, analyze, going along with that word analysis, and figuring every imaginable way, every imaginable way that any taking could occur. I'd like to ask Senator Wickersham a question, before I proceed. And maybe he hit this already, but I did not hear it. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: What is...what does taking of property mean...

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Well, Senator,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...in your amendment?