statute and the law defining it applied to anybody who engages in that kind of conduct, but since a lot of people who are in the Legislature now were not here at the time the code was revised it probably is easy for you to accept the statement of Senator Pirsch who was not here either and admitted it that people didn't know what was in it, they didn't know what they were voting for. They hadn't read this, they hadn't read that. But I did read great portions of it and I had great portions of what was offered as a revision stricken out because I disagreed with it. There were times when I even because I couldn't get my way on specific things made motions to kill the entire code revision. Naturally I failed. But I did succeed in doing a lot of things on that code while it was being discussed. So I did understand what was in it, and I understood what ultimately I was voting for, including the things that I didn't like about it. But because something was in the law 20 years ago and had been there for a thousand years prior to that is no argument for saying, once it was reviewed and found to be wanting it should now be reinstated because at one time it was there. That kind of argument makes no sense to me as an argument justifying a certain kind of conduct. We should look at the merits of what it is we are considering, and if there is a logical, a rational, a justifiable basis for changing the law, then change it. But it should not be a certain group like the corrections people or the county attorneys who can wave a magic wand and say, we want this, we are the upholders and guardians of society and if we tell you something is good, you take it as good and run with it, that should not be. It won't be for me. And probably the easy thing to do would be to just say, well, Senator Pirsch is a nice person and would not intentionally mislead anybody so even though there is language in this bill that she agreed to have stricken from a bill yesterday, let it go anyway. It boggles the mind. And there is a movie...not a movie, but a program on television whose title I think sums up what I have to say, "That's Incredible".

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Beutler. Senator Beutler, did you want to talk on it? The question before the House is the advancement of 465. All those in favor vote aye....did you want to close? All right, go ahead.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Senator Clark and other members of the body. The Crime Commission which was one of these proponents does have a varied assortment of people on the commission itself. I hope that you would look at this handout that I gave you. I do not have the statutes but I will see that they will get to your hands, the ones that