

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I am not sure if I want to support the amendment or simply vote against the resolution in its original form. I guess I would simply vote against the resolution in its original form if I thought it would be voted down. But because I am not sure of that I am standing up here to support the amendment at this time and I am simply afraid of the precedent that we would be setting and I would ask you just to think for a moment about two analogies. There is a minority in this state, a very conscientious minority, a minority who feels mostly, many of them for religious reasons that the death penalty in this state is an immoral act of law. And two years ago in this Legislature they convinced twenty-five of us that it was poor public policy and the Governor vetoed that bill. Last year that bill was reintroduced and this session I believe it is being studied again and the vote on that next session will be very close again. Now what are you going to tell Senator Chambers when he comes in here with a resolution and says, "Gentlemen, there is a conscientious minority out there who feel strongly that the death penalty is wrong. We have acted upon it and this body before in the past has actually reversed itself and abolished the death penalty. Next session the vote will be close again. Here I am before you to today with this resolution suggesting clearly that the death penalty not be enforced in this state until the Legislature has acted again." What are you going to say to Senator Chambers? I don't think you are going to have a good answer for him if you pass this resolution today. Let's take a second example. Motor vehicle inspection law. Nobody has suggested that the motor vehicle inspection law should not be enforced and yet, we took action last year to abolish it as of, I believe, July 1st of next year. What if somebody comes in with a resolution and says, "Let's not enforce the motor vehicle inspection law." Well that would probably make more sense than what we are doing today since we have already abolished it at a date certain in the future. These are just two examples. Every year, every year I have been here we have had a handful of emotional issues, a handful of close policy questions which we may very well reverse ourselves on at some point in the future but I don't think that we can come in here and suggest that any law should not be enforced. It is one thing to undermine authority in a system of law by blinking at the actions of citizens but it is an entirely different thing and a much more pernicious thing to suggest that those instruments of government who have been elected and identified as the enforcers of the law to suggest to them directly that they should not enforce the law, to encourage government itself not to enforce the law, I think that is a step that government should never take and certainly the body that makes the laws should never take. I agree with Senator Cullan that the law in force should be the