

would ask you. Now the amendment that I am dealing with is on page 3 and we are talking now about the right to assemble and associate which is going to be infringed by this bill. The language of the bill would make it a Class IV felony for any person to assemble with one or more persons for the purpose of training, practicing, or being instructed in the use of and all these things we have been talking about for the purpose of using these things in furtherance of a civil disorder or in a civil disorder. Now the difficulty with this is in the language itself. If you take the first sentence, "For any person to assemble with one person", then you come down to lines 13 and 14, then one of the people is not going to have a problem if he or she indicates that it was not his or her intent to do anything wrong. They start out talking about one person, but before the crime is committed, you have to have persons intending to do whatever was being done. So if one person gets together with the purpose of instructing that somebody do these terrible things, but the other person does not intend that, then the crime is not committed. So you won't be guilty if you assemble for that purpose, but if you teach for that purpose and the others have no intent, then they still have got you. So it is a bad proposition that is in line with the rest of the bad things in this bill. People should have the right to assemble and they should have the right to associate with whomever they please for whatever purpose which is lawful. The assembling that would occur were this bill not in place would be lawful. There is no overt act which must occur that makes these people violators of the law. Again, you need a mind reader and a fortuneteller to determine that the purpose these people have in mind is to do something in furtherance of or in a civil disorder. But the civil disorder itself is not a crime, and for somebody with the understanding that Senator Beutler has of these issues and the way he discussed them in the Judiciary Committee when he was speaking against a bill such as this, for him to turn around and now support this causes me to wonder what happened between that time and today because he is not discussing in detail his support for the bill as he was able to discuss in detail and with specificity his objection to it. So I have to wonder if it is the bill itself that he is supporting, and the reason I mentioned Senator Beutler is because, although it is offensive to him, I'd know from what he said in the Judiciary Committee what his attitude toward this kind of legislation is, or I guess I would have to say was. I know what his attitude was and something happened