

probably illustrated what I was going to get up and try to say and that was that, indeed, there can be a taking of property without compensation by the implementation of regulations, and these are generally enacted under the...under the police powers or health, safety and welfare powers of the government. And that's not to say that those regulations wouldn't still be able to be implemented after the passage of 168, that's not the case at all. But one effect might be that if the agency isn't already doing so, it would require them to stop, analyze the financial impact to the property owners and decide whether, in fact, it is advisable to go ahead and implement the regulation or not. And I guess that's something that I would like to get back and emphasize a little bit with this legislation. This legislation, as far as I'm concerned on my part, is not part of any larger agenda. I consider this piece of legislation to be a preventative measure to keep the state out of trouble under certain situations, to avoid claims and lawsuits that might be forthcoming if we unknowingly or unwittingly or miscalculatingly implement a number of regulations that do have an effect on the right of people to possess, enjoy and use their property. If we're going to do that under the police powers of the state or under the health, safety, welfare powers that we have, then we should do it with knowing full well what the impact is, knowing that there are going to be implications, there are going to be unhappy people, but it's worth it because it's in the public's interest to do so. And if we make that determination after full and fair consideration then so be it, implement the regulation and that's much better, in my opinion, than going along not fully looking at and focusing on the implications on people and their property as fully as we should and waking up six months or a year later and saying, my gosh, what, you know, what did we do here, what kind of regulations were implemented? Now this is, you know, I find it, I find it really interesting that we are really afraid of what this law is going to do. This law is about as benign as it can be, in my opinion, to creating burdens on the state and causing us to do anything differently than what we've done. The only thing that I think it does is it says to the agencies, look, before you do adopt these regulations and before you have your public hearing, take a look and see what this does do to people's property, whether or not this is going to represent a taking in some sense of the word and, if so, let's be open about it, let's be up front about it, let's consider that before, before we pass the regulation, consider whether or not we need to amend the regulation. And, you know, the...I guess we don't want to talk about federal examples, but