

but I'd like to ask him, Senator Preister, specifically what does this one do that's different from the prior one that you offered which was similar to it?

SENATOR PREISTER: Well, the one that I had offered on General File gave consideration to people living within a ten-mile radius of the particular area that would be proposed for licensure. So it took in a much broader area and the debate on the floor was such that said that's too far away. So I tried to limit it more, and that was my attempt in the language that I've drafted here.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And this would reduce the distance to how much?

SENATOR PREISTER: Well, this says in the determination it would be in giving a definition to public interest. It wouldn't have a specific geographical area, but it talks about the immediate adjoining property owners.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Is Senator Schrock available because I don't...oh, Senator Hudkins is at the desk. Senator Schrock, I'd like to ask you a question because I think you said you're opposed to this amendment?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Schrock.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schrock, did you say you're opposed to this amendment?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I am.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Even though the language did not give a specific distance but rather says consideration has to be given to the interests of the adjoining landowners? That's too harsh a regulation in your view?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well, I think it's already covered by our existing laws is I think where I'm coming from.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If it's already covered, Senator Schrock, how can this one do any harm? And I'm not trying to be argumentative.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well,...