

tremendous emotional strain already, and I can relate to that emotional strain. I can only tell you that I think that there is a lot of people out there, I don't think I am that unusual, there is a lot of people out there that have got over all those other things. They are looking forward instead. They are saying it doesn't make any difference who is to blame, it doesn't make any difference that I feel terrible about this situation, but the fact is out of adversity comes opportunities and we are looking forward. So I think we are talking about a very small group of people, first of all, and I think, secondly, we are trying to build something in that the current law had ought to be able to address. So I urge you to support Senator Chambers in his motion. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I certainly would oppose Senator Chambers' amendment and you should understand that his amendment goes right to the heart of the bill, and if you adopt his amendment, you have effectively eliminated half of the bill, that is the basic effect. Now there has been much discussion of intent in trying to read people's intent, but you have to understand that even with your most basic criminal laws, the question of intent is there. Take a murder, for example, would Senator Chambers say that we shouldn't have a murder law because we have to distinguish between a person who is acting in self-defense and a person who is actively murdering somebody? That distinction has to be made, doesn't it? Intent has to be read. If you are in possession of burglary tools, that is a crime under our current law. Intent has to be read. Any law that you have has to distinguish between a number of intents and the jury has to find that you had a criminal intent, and the same is true of this bill. It is no different. In this bill you have to prove that there was intent to cause a civil disorder. A civil disorder is defined. It has to be a public disturbance. It has to involve an act of violence. It has to create immediate danger or result in damage or injury to persons or to property. You can go on defining things and define the things that you define and define the things that define the things that you define until you are crazy. The Constitution is careful to require definition to the extent that your terms cannot be vague, so that people can understand the law, but if you read these definitions