

100 different directions of discussion of an amendment that would put us back to where we were before all of this happened is irrelevant? It's not irrelevant. It's unanswerable. Senator Beutler cannot find a rational persuasive argument against doing what Senator Hall is recommending by his amendment. I'm not aware of anybody having said that this language that Senator Hall is offering to us needed to be amended prior to the Hall amendment to which my name was added, that resulted in these provisions being changed. So now to go back to that language which has been construed by the court and you can see a listing of some of the cases below the provisions to let you know how the court has ruled when those provisions were involved in the case. When you have that, what do you need that is more precise? I'd like to ask Senator Beutler another question. And, Senator Beutler, this will be away from the irrelevant amendment of Senator Hall. Where is Senator...oh, Senator Beutler, is there as much certitude about how the court would rule on the Dierks amendment in LR 6CA with the Dierks amendment...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...as it is about the court's opinion relative to the language prior to 1988 when decisions had been rendered? I'm saying...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Restate that, please, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: All right, now prior to the 1988 change there was language in the Constitution which had been construed by the court. Is there more certitude about what a court will do if LR 6CA is passed with the Dierks amendment as there is about the language that existed prior to 1988 which had already been construed by the court?

SENATOR BEUTLER: I believe so, Senator, absolutely.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So you think there's more...okay, then how will the court rule on LR 6CA?

SENATOR BEUTLER: On LR 6CA?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, if it becomes law with the Dierks amendment, how will the court rule?