

SENATOR BROMM: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So the two things are entirely different.

SENATOR BROMM: I don't want to take your time but they're not, because if you can't use your house, what's the...what's the sense in owning it?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: First of all, I'll tell...

SENATOR BROMM: And if I can't use my land, what is the sense in owning it?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You can use your land. I cannot...they cannot tell me I can't live in my house, but here's what they can tell me. I cannot set fire to my house if, by so doing, I endanger somebody else or...

SENATOR BROMM: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...if I pollute...

SENATOR BROMM: Right. I understand that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the air. Those are things that I cannot do because there is a harm to the public that results from that. They're not talking about my individual property right, they're talking about the good of society and the protection of society. The water is not owned. The house is owned.

SENATOR BROMM: I understand that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So the two cannot be compared. Between two things disparate in nature, there can be no comparison, no comparison. So you want to compare something which is not owned with something which is. If I don't own it, nobody can take it from me because it wasn't mine in the first place. If the house is owned by me and they deprive me of the use of it, that is a taking from me of that which is mine.

SENATOR BROMM: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And I might sound like I'm being argumentative and I probably am but I don't intend to be that way with you because you were trying to give an example to