

ought not be in the statutes. So every time he speaks in behalf of this bill, there is something deep inside him carrying on an argument saying you should be against it. But here is what I think is being missed here. We are not talking about what the teacher knows about what the teacher is doing. We are talking about the teacher knowing what somebody else will do. And to show how Senator Beutler's example makes no sense, if he teaches the person to make the bomb and the person had said that they are going to blow up Mayor Luedtke's office tomorrow, tomorrow passes and the office is not blown up, how can you say he knew what was going to happen when it did not happen. The only way you can know what is going to happen in the future is if that time passes and the event that you say you knew would happen does in fact occur. If the act does not occur, you cannot say two days ago I knew this was going to happen because it never did. To have knowledge requires an event or an occurrence or some thing in which knowledge can inhere or to which knowledge can attach itself, and it might sound metaphysical here but Senator Beutler knows what I am talking about and he knows that there is no other statute in the books that talks about...now Senator Beutler asked how do I know what he knows. Based on what I have heard him discuss in the past and things that he has said, so I base my knowledge today on past events that have already occurred, so rather than telling the future or reading Senator Beutler's mind, I am dealing with history and those things that have already transpired, and anybody who is observant will know what I know about what Senator Beutler knows on this particular issue. But here is the point, Senator Beutler knows that there is not another statute that can be produced which says that a person commits a crime because he or she knew what somebody else was going to do without any overt act occurring, without any complicity or working together to carry out that end. Now if Senator Beutler is talking about conspiracy, then the ultimate act does not have to occur but nobody will be convicted of conspiracy unless they have had an active part in the planning or putting together or setting into motion those activities that will result in the illegal act. But, remember again, and Senator Higgins I wish would listen to this or had heard the earlier discussion, Senator Higgins, the civil disorder which would occur if it did is not a crime under this bill. That is not a crime. A civil disorder does not have to occur and you are still guilty of the crime. Even though if the civil disorder which is the