

SENATOR BEUTLER: On which portion of it, the two-tier system or the other portion?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, all of it. Any of it. How will the court rule?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well I hope they would rule, Senator, that it's all constitutional.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Hope means that there is lack of certitude.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I used the word certitude.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Witek.

SENATOR WITEK: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, it appears that we're now having the discussion that we probably originally should have had where we, discussing whether to put 6CA first instead of the Warner amendment. At that time we were just discussing the Warner amendment that allowed 22CA to go ahead of 6CA in the court system. Now that we're having the discussion that 6CA ahead of 22CA, we're coming up with the opposition to 6CA and I won't call this a frivolous amendment, but I'm not sure how sincere it is or how much work it is intended to really accomplish here. It's too bad that, I guess, Senator Hall is having guilt feelings at t'is point for what happened in the court systems and is trying with this amendment to assuage some of them. That's true, that's true, he has no guilt feelings. But in small portion it may be possible. I'll grant that it might be possible, but I guess we're just going to have lunch and not come to an agreement on this and it will just be saved for another day, but I don't feel that Senator Hall is sincere with this amendment and just really wants to have a discussion on the floor of the Legislature on the change that was made by the courts and I think we're past that discussion. I think that discussion has already been discussed and come to conclusion and now the discussion here is the Dierks amendment as opposed to in the order of 6CA coming ahead of 22CA instead of what we have now in the bill which is 22CA ahead of 6CA and I hope we can get to that discussion at some point. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Lindsay.