

the Fourteenth Amendment. I am perfectly comfortable relying on the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution, but I would like to see the state have the ability to appeal any U.S...any State Supreme Court decisions to the U.S. Supreme Court so that our interpretation was the same as what is generally the case in every other state.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Seeing no other lights, Senator Landis, do you wish to close?

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. First, thank you to my colleagues who did not foreclose this debate and allow it not to continue, and also I hope we recognize that we have debated this quite fully. There has been no attempt to cut it off or short-circuit it that I have participated in in this situation. The arguments against the amendment are twofold. They are both good arguments but they are both contradictory. One of the arguments is, you don't need the word "rational" because the Fourteenth Amendment...that is the same thing. I am sorry, you don't need to strike it because rational is the same goal as the Fourteenth Amendment and you're really just repeating that which would apply. So taking it out doesn't have any more logic than leaving it in because the goal is, in fact, exactly the same, a line of questioning that Senator Lindsay and Senator Hall pursued. The other argument is there is protection in that word. There is protection for the powerless. There is protection for those who aren't strong enough to come down here. There is protection and political value in that word. We don't know exactly what it means but it should be certainly a minimum, an acceptable one, and maybe it is different than the Fourteenth Amendment, and that is not a bad thing either. But you can't have it both ways. I suggest that we take this analysis in trying to break the deadlock. There are opponents and there are proponents of doing something by constitutional amendment. And the opponents also have some variation. They don't like what is before us, but if there were other additional agreements, elements, additions, maybe something could be worked out. I happen to be a proponent of the constitutional amendment. I believe Senator Warner and I believe Senator Kristensen are, they have spoken in favor of this. I am inclined to think that Professor Lyons' analysis was very good, very helpful. Senator Withem, Senator Will, Senator Chambers, and Senator Hall have been largely opponents to the constitutional amendment, although with some openness to some other considerations. I would suggest in this case that this has been the first opening salvo