

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But in line...

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...(inaudible) get rid of that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But in lines 1 and 2 above we have a description of the type of property which may be taken.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then what you're leaving is an explanation of where that description can be obtained.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. At least I follow that. Oh, and now is it on my own time, Mr. President?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: I'm sorry?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Am I on my own time now, for my light on?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: In about six seconds you will be.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Well, I'll stand in silence.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, with Senator Beutler having read what the language is that would be left, it does make as much sense as this can under the circumstances. With his amendment it will make a lot more sense than it currently does, and his deletions will not take anything away from the bill that those who are supporting it say that they want. There would still be, under existing language, the requirement...a description, but not necessarily quantification of the fiscal impact on the state agencies, political subdivisions and persons being regulated, or an explanation of where the description of the fiscal impact may be inspected and obtained. That would be available under the existing law. So he is striking unnecessary language. Is Senator Wickersham near? Senator Wickersham, have you looked at Senator Beutler's amendment, and if so, what is your reaction to it?