

intent is to use it in a way that is illegal. I can give you quickly an example. There is nothing illegal in this state about owning a weapon. An officer cannot simply say without some overt evidence that he believes you intend to use that weapon for an unlawful purpose, therefore, he can arrest you because of what your intent is. This bill requires no overt act. It has been before us before, not the entire Legislature, but it has been killed in committee. It is a bill that B'nai B'rith wants. They have been pushing it all over the country and Mr. Crouse has worked, done yeomanlike work to try to get it enacted here. When he worked for Senator Hoagland, Senator Hoagland introduced it. Now he works for Senator Chizek and he has gotten Senator Chizek to introduce it, and he is Senator Beutler's campaign manager, and Senator Beutler has switched his position of being against it to now being for it, and you will notice that the co-signers of the bill are Chizek, Beutler, and Hoagland. So that alone does not make the bill invalid but it shows you the source of it, and some people and groups may have very real concerns about these items that Senator Chizek described that these groups are talking about and doing but, remember, these groups hate black people also. So it would seem that I would be up here saying wipe out the shield, the sword, and the arm of the Lord, wipe out the Aryan Nation, but when you try to use the law and you write bad legislation which does not go directly to dealing with the purpose announced, that type of legislation should not be enacted. There is nothing in this bill that mentions a hate group, is there? There is nothing in this bill that mentions an anti-Semitic or antiblack group, is there? It could apply to a group of farmers sitting around in a coffee shop upset about what happened to Arthur Kirk, and the sheriff could be concerned about some possible dissident activity or even expressions of opinions, and say, in my opinion, in my judgment, the intent of these people is to foment civil disorder, and I believe that they are teaching techniques to carry out this disorder, and they would fall within this law, and they could be arrested. This is a perfect bill for harassment. Now it places everything in the total discretion of the officer, and I am going to walk through the bill step by step, but the first presentation has to just be a few general terms. This bill is so bad that what we ought to do is emasculate it, eviscerate it, then eliminate it. It is not going to touch a single matter that has been discussed by Senator Chizek. Now why would this bill be bad also?