

indeterminable new costs." In other words, opposing this bill isn't a matter of being liberal and conservative, it's a matter of being fiscally responsible and I think that's a real important issue that we do need to take into account. I believe that what Senator Bernard-Stevens has proposed and suggested is that we do a resolution rather than actually putting this in statute. I believe that Senator Jones and other supporters' intent is to raise the issue to say that there are some unfair takings and I think there are and I agree with that. However, I still continue to maintain that this is a two-edged sword and that it would also likely do far more than protect those people in their property rights. It would do far more in other areas in terms of costs and what we could do to our budget than what we're looking at. I think the same principle could be accomplished in a resolution that Senator Jones is attempting to accomplish with his bill. It likely could save us some time and I think, in addition to doing that, it would accomplish what he is attempting to do...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR PREISTER: ...and this bill as it stands would do absolutely nothing about federal takings. It would do absolutely nothing to control what the federal government is currently doing. It would do virtually nothing to what we're doing in the state except add more language to our statutes, add a whole lot more workload and bureaucracy to our existing agencies when we're trying to streamline government, when we're trying to cut what they're doing and accomplish virtually nothing. I think Senator Jones has certainly brought the issue forward. He has certainly looked out for his constituents. That is going to happen and is happening and I appreciate that he's doing that. I think, and I would encourage him to look at the possibility of a resolution in place of this bill. With that, I thank you for your consideration and hope that the members who aren't here would seriously look at this as an unfunded mandate. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Preister. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, excuse me, I had stated that this...the offering of these amendments gives an opportunity to look at things in the Constitution and I know many people have not read it at all. But in Section 2 of Article 1 we find these words. "There shall