and if their credit is not good they will not get tax exempt bonds. You know as well as I people who buy those bonds are not going to buy high risk bonds and I would also suggest that Senator Warner's amendment that it really should be in the form of a bill placed in an appropriate committee so if we want to provide this exemption of this type of issues for many, then this body could make that determination at a later date. I noticed Senator Beutler has a real concern about tax exempt bonds and several others do too and this has been in this bill, in a way it has never been hidden and I guess I am at the nintieth day of this session, just damn mad and I excuse that expression, but I will take 321 either in its present position or nothing at all and I remind you the only way you are going to find out whether it is constitutional is pass it. Let somebody challenge it. Then if we have to go to a constitutional amendment we can build that amendment and go to the people and that is the way I would like to see it happen and I would oppose Senator Warner's amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I also support Senator Warner's amendment. Since people with the feeling like Senator Higgins don't care about the Constitution when it gets in the way, we may as well add this provision so that everybody can get into the act. I don't think the amendment will make the bill any more constitutionally objectionable than it already is. Now it is one thing to look at the issue of whether or not what we do conforms to the Constitution and what the purpose of what we are doing is, but before you can talk about a lofty purpose you do have to look at the procedure that is being employed and whether the Constitution allows the state to do such a thing. Now I hate to say because I am supporting Senator Warner's amendment, but when I used to be on the Executive Board I would ask them, Senator Higgins, to take away the Chaplain's salary and they refused and I would say well I would have to go to court and I think Senator Warner was one who said, "Go to court then," and I went to court and the court said, yes, it is excessive state entanglement and he can't be paid. He can pray if he wants to but it was also stated that even if he is not paid, having the same preacher all the time can give the appearance of the state favoring one religion over another so as a result we have had a multiplicity of different types of individuals up there praying or whatever they do because I understand Senator DeCamp was up there one day too. So that whole lawsuit served a wholesome purpose, but I think what it really should do is bring us face to face with our obli-