

against this amendment altogether or you can let it be added to the Landis amendment, then you can reject the amended Landis amendment, in which case the bill would be in its present form. But I think, Senator Pirsch, you're following me but I think what I laid out is too many steps for most of my colleagues to stay with me, so I got to the second step they fell off the train, and now they don't even know what I'm talking about. But, anyway, and since I said train they probably think I'm talking about Jesse James and Frank James robbing the train. It would be a situation where if you want the bill in its present form without an amendment then when cloture comes vote against this amendment, but then I don't know if you would have enough votes to get cloture, and then if you got cloture then Senator Lindsay would be in a position of supporting a bill with which he disagrees and it would have some parts which, if the bill must pass, I think ought to be in it, because they're unconstitutional. They're harsh, but they need to be there. Where is Senator Witek? I wanted to ask her view on this idea of taking away this running down a police officer, or trying to. Now that is...let me ask Senator Lindsay a question. Senator Lindsay,...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yeah.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...does the bill, as it's written now, authorize the running down a police officer?

SENATOR LINDSAY: You have to have a license.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But if you have a license then you're authorized to run them down, attempt to strike them or collide with them. Is that authorized under the bill or prohibited?

SENATOR LINDSAY: It's prohibited.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And your amendment does what?

SENATOR LINDSAY: On this?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, on the running down of the cops.

SENATOR LINDSAY: It strikes the...strikes the language of recklessly doing it to limit it to the intentional and knowing