

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, I think you changed those in the committee amendments.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Changed what, Senator Dierks? I'm really having trouble following you.

SENATOR DIERKS: You added a new section on the...the committee amendments added a new section. Am I not right?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes.

SENATOR DIERKS: Section 8...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, I see what you're driving at, um-huh.

SENATOR DIERKS: ...18-9.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Right.

SENATOR DIERKS: And if that whole section would be stricken, because didn't you strike Section...well...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: But then, Senator Dierks, if it's stricken it doesn't replace what's already in the constitution, right? So you still have left what's already in the constitution, which is what we have now. And even if that weren't true, if the whole thing is stricken your language would be stricken too, so what do you accomplish?

SENATOR DIERKS: I think that the...the point that I'm trying to make, Senator Schimek, is that I'm not sure what would be stricken when the Supreme Court acts on this, and I want to just...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Well, I understand that, Senator Dierks. But all I'm suggesting to you is that if it's all stricken, your language will be stricken, too...

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, no, that may not be so if they just strike that particular section that deals with what...the changes that were made by the committee amendments. Then I don't know that we have the...I want to know we have the guarantee, the protection.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Well, but if they say those aren't