

January 22, 1974

(Start Belt #11)

kill motion, and Senator Cavanaugh's amendment. If you adopt Senator Cavanaugh's motion then literally you are destroying the intent of the bill. So you just as well go ahead and kill it. Now I would suggest for example to Senator Chambers, that I frankly had there wasn't a question that was asked of me this morning that I did not answer. The only reason for requesting for example that the bill be laid over for a week, was so that if there was some question in somebody's mind, we would have enough time to discuss it and get the various individuals on the Legislature enough time to consider what their effects of their speeches this morning would have on the bill. I see nothing wrong since for example, Senator Chambers has withdrawn his motion to just leaving the bill right where it is for one week, and I'll get a chance to discuss this with not only Senator Cavanaugh, who has proposed the amendment but with anybody else, and I've got a list here of everyone of you who have talked on it, and I'll be in contact with each and everyone of you to discuss your fears with relation to this bill and we can take it up a week from today.

PRESIDENT: Once again, Senator Goodrich is renewing his motion then to delay the bill for a week and the chair would ask then are there objections to delaying. Is that your question Senator Goodrich..to delaying it for a week, the chair again is asking is there objections to the motion to delay the bill for a week. Senator Barnett you are objecting.

SENATOR BARNETT: Yes.

PRESIDENT: Then there will have to be a motion made. You can't get unanimous consent. And what is your pleasure Senator Goodrich.

SENATOR GOODRICH: I so move.

PRESIDENT: Now the motion before us is that the bill be laid over for a week. And that is the motion to discuss at this time. Question is shall the bill laid over for a week. Now who wants to be heard on that particular motion. Senator Kremer.

SENATOR KREMER: Mr. Chairman, I support the motion to lay the bill over for one week, because I'm not sure what Senator Cavanaugh's amendment would do in that he strikes "not" on line 5 of the bill. I'm not sure what if we're not..if this might cloud the issue relative to taking the property by eminent domain. Because here it says, those will come into the picture that are taking property, by a willing buyer and a willing seller. On a willing buyer and a willing seller based..Senator Cavanaugh, I'm not sure striking that out is going to only that which you think it is going to do.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: I'm not sure I understand the nature of your problem, Senator Kremer. My amendment by striking not, it would then read, the provisions in Section 2501 through 2506 relating to public notice and public hearing shall apply to any agency acquiring property of a willing buyer, willing seller, basis or by gift or any form of voluntary transfer, so that the effect of that amendment