

separate the wheat from the chaff, that we have to be able to make a distinction between those who are legitimately striving for a waiver and those who are trying to circumvent the law and trying to lower the educational quality of our schools. So as far as I am concerned, although Senator Chambers has not perhaps got the absolute answer, he is pointing in the direction toward the answer that we probably are looking for and I would encourage again Senator DeCamp and Senator Landis and some of the others, Senator Fowler as I think also talked about this area that we are discussing at this point, that this is the area we need to work out our differences and this is the area in which there is some hope yet, that gray area that I was talking about before, that there may still be a promise of resolving the issue and I would say that Senator Chambers' amendment does point out better than any other one we have discussed today where exactly we might be able to work out some of these conflicts that we are discussing this full day today. So I do support the Chambers amendment with the understanding it probably has no chance. Nevertheless, I think you all ought to keep in mind the debate that is going on here because this is really the nub of the problem.

SENATOR HEFNER: Before we go to the next motion, I would like to introduce former Senator Murphy. He is under the North balcony. Senator Murphy, would you like to hold up your hand. We now have an amendment to the Chambers amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Landis would move to amend the Chambers amendment: (Read Landis amendment found on pages 1075 and 1076, Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR HEFNER: Senator Landis, on your amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR LANDIS: Right. Let me do this slowly. Ernie has got his pen out. Since we are doing bill drafting on the floor, we have to go a little slow here and I do have a grade school education so I will do this very slowly for everyone. Ernie has changed in line 19 "shall" to "may". The difficulty with that is that it simply means the Board has absolute discretion to do whatever it wishes under whatever conditions for whatever reasons. His argument is if you don't...if there is no way to prove that you have state or federal funds or whether or not the law constitutes an interference with the religious instruction, so the "may" goes too far. After the new "may" you add the words "not deny the waiver if both of the conditions stated in Section 1 are met", and those two conditions are the state or federal