

compensation", there are other issues that I have discussed. But let me get back to these words, "with or without compensation". First of all, the state cannot take property without compensation. The state cannot, except as you all authorized them to do under the Micron bills, take private property from one private owner and give it to another private owner. They can do that, but even that must be with compensation. I defy anybody...here comes Senator Landis. Senator Landis, do you support this bill? Oh, he said no so I won't ask him that question. Senator Will said he doesn't either. Senator Jensen, you support this bill, don't you? Okay, I would like to ask you a question.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Jensen, would you respond to a question?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Jensen, first of all, I want to see if we agree on some basic principles. The state does have the power to condemn property for public use but it must give compensation for it.

SENATOR JENSEN: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Can you think of any instance...and, see, so it's clear what I'm talking about, I don't mean where they don't have the power to go in with the National Guard and throw somebody off their land, I'm not talking about that. Can you think of any instance where the state legally can take somebody's property without compensating them?

SENATOR JENSEN: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I can't either. And that's why I want to strike these words "taking with or without compensation". It introduces some...and that's all I wanted to ask you. Thank you. It introduces something into the discussion which has no business being here, but I hope you don't adopt the amendment because it would leave the kind of confusion and poor drafting that I want the bill to have. I'm going to see if somebody can tell me why these words ought to be left in though.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you. Senator Will, you are recognized.