

Initiative 300, and tried to replace it with language that would allow the Legislature to do some control, rather than to have it in the constitution. Recognizing, I believe that the intent of Senator Dierks is to see that if Initiative 300 is on the books it needs to be enforced. I don't necessarily disagree with that at all. My point, probably as this debate goes on somewhat, is that how difficult, and that was one of the premises before how very difficult it is to enforce Initiative 300 simply because of the way it is written. My concern with the amendment though, that we have right now, is that what we are looking at here is you are striking what is basically the basis and the reporting form. I don't disagree with the top part of it and looking at what...whether or not it needs to be financial institutions that has to go through all the records, so on and so forth, to comply, but there needs to be some basis for the reporting form. I have difficulty in understanding, and perhaps you can help me here, Senator Dierks, that if you have no basis, if you don't use, there is a lot in this particular constitutional amendment in requirements that says who is exempt, who is not, and there is a lot that goes into that criteria. It talks about kindred and your relation. It talks about how long you have to be involved, how much time you spend in the operation, it talks about who is the major stockholder. If we remove the wording that says the basis, the criteria, the reason how you are going to develop these forms are stricken from your amendment, I see no real way for us to be able to develop the form to accomplish what it is that you are looking at in determining who could, who is in compliance, and perhaps who is out of compliance with the constitution when it comes to family owned corporations. For that reason, I am looking at striking, again only the lines 13 through 16, that looks at a reporting basis. And not to have that included, I believe would be, would totally defeat what it is you are trying to accomplish here to find out who basically is in compliance and who is not. With that, I would like to see some of the response or hear some of the response from Senator Dierks and see what it is we could do with this amendment. Looking at it, I do not wish again to strike the whole amendment, only that one part, Senator Dierks.

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** The matter before the body now then is the Hillman amendment to the Dierks amendment. We have had a number of lights on for some time. I will go through the list and see if everybody wants to address this. Senator Wehrbein, will you be addressing the Hillman amendment? Senator Schrock, will you