SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Beutler, let me acknowledge two things that might help explain the situation. As originally drafted, state entities and political subdivisions could be holders. It was the work of our Natural Resources Committee who said, no, we don't want the state or political subdivisions to be holders. They made a specific decision to do that. We didn't go back and bill draft to make every implication do that, having said as specifically as we did that the state couldn't be a holder. I think the point that you're raising here is that perhaps the drafting could be more well synthesized. If that's the case, we could do that easily between now and Select File. If the implication is that it's a mistake to be...that we shouldn't let the state be a holder,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Landis, we're now on your...

SENATOR LANDIS: ...which is the impact of your amendment,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: We're now on your time, Senator.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...that would be good for it. But if this is about drafting, I think we could draft better, because there are two thoughts there. The controlling meaning is, the state may not be a holder. And that's what we mean for this to say. To the extent that we need to do something better, I think that would...I would be available to do that off the floor, and draft appropriately, if that's the nature of the controversy.

SENATOR CUDABACK: We're now on your time, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: And I will give some back to Senator Beutler, because I'm sure he's not done with this. I just want to make this point. What I can't understand is that Senator...is Senator Beutler saying the state should be a holder? Because that's the effect of the amendment. The point that he's making, which, by the way, I acknowledge and I think is true, is that the language that's now there was drafted originally to allow the state to be a holder; then we made one declaration, the state can't be a holder, but didn't go back and harmonize the rest of it to fit with that element, so that there is an implication that is in fact in conflict. I'm not troubled by