

consider a violation which was neither knowing nor intentional to be the basis for revoking a license, the little ones could be eased right out of the picture. When we go to the other page where we're talking about misrepresentations, the term "misrepresentation" without my amendment is not modified, so anything which is stated differently from what the facts are would constitute a misrepresentation. The only kind of misrepresentation which I think should put a person in jeopardy of losing a license is if it's knowing and intentional. The purpose of my amendment in both cases is to make sure that inadvertence will not subject a person to license revocation. Accident or inattentiveness will not subject a person to revocation of license. The analogy that I could draw might be, and it's a rough one, to what happens if you underpay your taxes. Before you can be punished criminally, it must be shown that you intended and know...you intentionally and knowingly evaded or avoided paying taxes. If you simply fail to do so or understate your taxes through accident naturally you have to pay those taxes and whatever penalty is attached, but there is no criminal culpability involved. So what I want to do with this amendment in both instances, both where it's talking about violating the provisions of this statute, this series of statutes, and also a misrepresentation in filling out the license, I want it crystal clear that accidents don't count. Obviously, if a person erroneously does something which puts him or her in violation of these requirements it would be necessary to bring yourself back into compliance. That's not what I'm talking about. This doesn't give you a free ride, but that accidental noncompliance will not subject you to losing your license. This language is designed to deal with the area of license revocation. As I explained to the lady and the gentlemen out in the corridor, or the Rotunda, this is one of those situations where I may differ with whether or not there should be these shooting areas in the first place, but once the law takes effect and I lost the argument on the floor and the shooting areas are allowed under the law I then look at the different matter which is will the law, as it exists, apply equally to everybody? So let's say we have "Little Shot A" and "Big Shot B" and both of them commit a knowing, intentional violation. If they go after "Little Shot" then he or she can insist that they go after "Big Shot" too or there is a denial of equal protection of the law. They're not being treated equally. And since the language is mandatory, "shall", if they go after the little one they've got to go after the big one too. If you leave the language "may" then the department, under the law, can