

constitutional bounds. Good goal, better, more flexible mechanisms are available to us than passing this amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the things I was going to say have been largely said by Senator Landis. Not having a background in law as Senator Beutler and Senator Landis have, I cannot be near as eloquent as they can on these fine points. But I think Senator Beutler has our own welfare in mind, but I do agree with Senator Landis on the method to accomplish it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members, I also rise to oppose the amendment by Senator Beutler, not only for the reasons that Senator Landis brought forth, but also from the standpoint that many of these issues are quite complicated and it has been my experience with a number of Attorneys General and lawyers as a whole that they can't accomplish this in five days, that the research may be too complicated to be brought to a logical conclusion in five days and so that would, I think, be an unsurmountable problem if this amendment was adopted, so I would oppose the amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Lamb. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I also rise to oppose the amendment and for a slightly different reason than those offered thus far, although I agree with them. This would, by law, inject the Attorney General into the legislative process and limit our activities as a Legislature. Recently the Attorney General injected himself into consideration of a bill that would have allowed us to hire our own legal counsel and said that it would be a violation of the separation of powers. What could be more blatant than to say that we cannot even vote on a piece of legislation until we get an opinion from the Attorney General especially when we see from the current incumbent that he is going to offer legislation which imposes penalties with which some of us may disagree and whose constitutionality may be suspect. So let's say that a bill that the Attorney General offers works its way before us and we seek an opinion from him or her as to the constitutionality of it, since it's his or hers you know what