

the language saying that a valid, legal reason should be taken out of the bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Is there anyone else that wishes to speak on the Haberman amendment? Anyone wish to speak on the Haberman amendment to the committee...? Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I guess I need to have Senator Haberman go over that one more time since I didn't understand what the amendment does. On Section 4, page 3, line 1 you're striking all words after...

SENATOR HABERMAN: Claim to the word should.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Claim. Through the word should.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Yup, it says...

SENATOR BEUTLER: In what line?

SENATOR HABERMAN: Line 1 and line 2.

SENATOR BEUTLER: So it would now read that after carefully considering the facts the Legislature determines that the contract claim and the tort claim be allowed and paid.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Should be allowed and paid and...yes, that's right.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR HABERMAN: I'm taking out valid legal basis...(interruption.)

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I would certainly oppose this particular amendment. Basically, as I understand it, what Senator Haberman is saying is in the one instance, for example, that the tort claim doesn't have a valid legal basis. He is striking that language that has reference to the tort claim. Now in the instance of that particular claim the district court has already ascertained and issued a decree indicating that they approved of the settlement, that there was a legal basis to the settlement and, therefore, I would think that the striking of that language would be entirely inappropriate and factually incorrect and on that basis I wouldn't think