

want to make one point. Senator Landis is so good in the way he outlines his feelings about this bill. And he talks about the Constitution and how we should repay people that attack the constitutionality of a bill successfully. And, theoretically, I agree with that. But I also think that the implication there is that political subdivisions and bodies of...city councils and county boards are sitting down there, in their capacities, drafting unconstitutional legislation on a consistent basis. And, I would suggest that that isn't the way they work. And, we have, in effect, I think, solved the problem with the amendment, the rule and regulation amendment. And I agree with Senator Beutler's amendment as well. But I don't see, Senator Landis, how what you're saying has particularly anything to do with the amendments that have been offered. And, with that, I just would suggest that we go ahead and adopt the Beutler amendment and pass the bill at that point. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Further discussion on the Beutler amendment. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chariman and members of the Legislature, I've been downstairs listening to this bill, trying to restrain myself from coming up to make any comments. But as soon as I heard Senator Beutler's amendment, I tore out of my office like a bat out of Hades, well, like a bat out of a belfry. My office is not to be equated with Hades. But, at any rate, I've had experience with being prosecuted under state statutes, there are always traffic matters, by the way, so I can get that clear, and under city ordinances. And I've won, in both instances, several times under state prosecutions. Let me give you an example of one under the state. There was a statute ruled, and I would not be able to recover even if this bill were in place on the incident I'm going to talk about. A bill had been struck down 10 years ago as unconstitutional. There's a vendetta, obviously, that the Lancaster County Attorney's Office has with me, lawyers in this county have said it, there are even people who are connected, not judges, connected with the judicial system who have analyzed it and have said it, at least one editor has agreed with it. So, this 10-year-old statute, that had been struck down, was used to charge me. I had to go to the trouble of doing the research, filing a brief, doing all on my own what an ordinary citizen would have to pay a lawyer to do and couldn't afford to do, filed it with the judge. The judge took considerable time to review it, then ruled in my favor and dismissed the charge because the statute that they used was