

SENATOR PREISTER: I apolo... Thank you, Honorable President, friends all. The last amendment was just adopted, is that... that correct?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: The Beutler amendment was adopted.

SENATOR PREISTER: Yes, I will withdraw that amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: It is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Chambers would move to amend. (See FA324 on page 2614-15 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this is an amendment which I'm going to send around and if you will turn with me, those who have an interest, in your book to page... I meant your bill to pages 34 and 35 I'll tell you what it does. While the copies are coming around, first of all, it would strike Senator Schrock's amendment which this morning changed "shall" to "may". I've talked to Senator Schrock about this and some of his constituents in the corridor and because I want to make it crystal clear what this amendment does I'm going to go into a bit more detail than maybe I ordinarily would on an amendment which has so little to it, but it does some things that are significant. On page 34, in line 26, if you want to follow, after the word "licensee" we would insert the words "knowingly and intentionally". At that point, it makes it clear that this language which talks about violation of the provisions of Sections 37-901 to 37-912 any such violation must be knowing and intentional. Then if you go to the top of page 35 and look in line 1, after the word "any" we would insert "knowing and intentional" before the word "misrepresentation". On the first part of the amendment, in talking about a violation of the law, there is nothing in this current language that says this violation has to be knowing and intentional, so a person, strictly by virtue of a mistake, could commit a violation and be subject to losing his or her license. With the "may" language in the bill, based on Senator Schrock's amendment, it would create a situation which none of us would like to see happen but which I think could happen where you might have unequally placed individuals operating these activities. If a large one that was visited by people with a lot of political clout did not want competition and we allow the Game and Parks Commission to