

is there anything in this resolution as introduced by Senator Koch that we are asking the law enforcement agencies to violate the laws or not carry out their duties to enforce the law?

SENATOR LANDIS: The language of the resolution is not framed in a way that requires them or specifically asks them to do it. The introducers and the people in the lobby state to me when in discussion, that the purpose is to send a signal to law enforcement officials, however, and it is a veiled message but I think it is there.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Well whether you call it veiled or not, it still says that they should take into consideration the Legislature's intent next year as to what we are going to do. It doesn't say what we are going to do. We may still go ahead with the law as it is today and not make any changes. It says that we intend to enact legislation and that they should take that into consideration but in no way, that I can see, does Senator Koch's resolution ask them not to enforce the law as it is today. Thank you very much.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I would just like to correct one statement that Senator Labeledz just made. The resolution as originally introduced does not say the Legislature intends to enact any legislation. It simply says there is an intention to consider and resolve the conflicts. There is no assurance that the Legislature can resolve any conflict in this matter because the same type of pressure which has brought the Legislature to its knees, where the Legislature finds itself now, will simply be intensified because this encourages people to feel that if they bring enough pressure to bear the Legislature will crumble and based on the activities of the Legislature in the past few days in this special session, they are completely entitled to hold that opinion about pressure causing the Legislature to crumble. But on this particular matter, if Senator Labeledz is saying that nothing in this resolution based on its language tells any people connected with law enforcement to not do their duty, then I see no reason not to adopt the amendment because the amendment says in affirmative language that they should do their duty. So, if the affirmative amendment is merely the opposite of the negative coin that the original resolution represents, here is what we come down to whether we state it affirmatively or negatively. There are laws enacted by the Legislature. There are agencies of government charged with the responsibility of enforcing those laws, that as far as the Legislature is concerned, those agencies should do their job based on the responsibilities imposed on them by law, which means that both of these resolu-