

thrust of this amendment is to deal with that member of the board who is now required to be a lawyer and an abstractor, a lawyer and an abstractor, and to change that to say that he will be a lawyer with experience in real estate. And the reason that I am doing that is that very inbreeding problem that was apparently on your mind in the last amendment. Remember that prior to this time, prior to this bill there were two lawyers on the board, but neither of them were required to be abstractors. Now there is only one lawyer and in addition to just being one lawyer, he is also required to be an abstractor, he or she. What is happening is that the board is becoming more inbred. There are only a handful of lawyers in the whole state who are also abstractors and that lawyer by virtue of being also an abstractor is under the board, subject to the board and has strings attached to him. So what I am suggesting to you with this amendment is that you allow that lawyer to be something other than an abstractor, other than tied into this little group, and allow him to simply be a lawyer who has some experience in real estate. And that gives a completely different perspective because abstractors essentially work for lawyers and that would give the perspective of someone who is using the services of the abstractor, who is judging the services of the abstractor on behalf of the public for whom the lawyer...by whom the lawyer is employed. So I think of all the amendments that I offer today that this one is the most important and I hope that to this one you will give your most careful consideration. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would rise to oppose Senator Beutler's proposed amendment. I had the same thought that he expressed. Had the other amendment been adopted, I would have got up and argued the same point that you were suggesting, Chris, that if you needed to be a knowledgeable lay person, then you ought to have to be a knowledgeable attorney in the abstracting as well. However, I am not sure the opposition of the word "knowledgeable" in the previous one was solely that it didn't feel it added anything. In this case I think there is logic based upon what I have understood has been experienced in the past where one or so of the attorneys that were previously on there really had very little experience and apparently it was an obstacle