

SENATOR BEYER: They are no longer a fraternal once they change so that would eliminate it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Remmers, your light is still on, do you wish to say any more on this issue? I guess you may close, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislature, I have given notice of my intention both to the floor, to the introducers and to the lobby on this issue. I would be happy to have 508 stopped in its tracks and have a public hearing, if that is the appropriate route. If we are going to pass on the concept of fraternal taxation and are unwilling to address that simply because of the lack of a hearing, perhaps the appropriate motion is to bracket the bill and have a public hearing. There has been public notice to interested parties. I just noticed Senator Beyer going beyond the ropes and asking for clarification from what are supposedly areas for visitors on this floor. I don't usually go over to the visitors' section and try to get information from the visitors to answer technical questions about a bill, but the visitors at least were appropriately warned that today was the day to be here to answer technical questions. I think there has been appropriate notice. There may have been a contravention of our rules, by the way, Mr. Speaker. But as far as the notice goes, there hasn't been a public hearing. I would be happy to have a public hearing on this topic. There was public notice to the interested parties. There has been a long history of this matter. There was a Journal entry last year and a public hearing as well. I did not need to go through the issue of a public hearing for myself because I have decided conceptually that I support the notion of equal taxation across the distinctions between fraternal and nonfraternals. Perhaps if my motion fails, I should ask for a public hearing on that or I should try to do it next year, but what I am telling you is I think this is a fair position to interject in discussions. I would be happy if the amendment is adopted and I bet Senator Beyer would be too, to take the bill back for a public hearing before the Revenue Committee because that would be an adequate chance to discuss the merits of the amendment and we could strip it off if after the public hearing we were wrong. But it seems to me that you want to create in the marketplace a level playing field. These people are out there competing in the same marketplace for business but we have tied the hands of