

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...my own expressed principles.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Discussion on the Chambers amendment. No further lights, Senator Chambers, you are recognized to close.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, the amendment that I am offering would go to line 22 on page 1, and it would strike the word "assessments". Senator Pirsch, as the primary sponsor of this proposal, has muddied the water in terms of what this means. So let's say the Legislature attempts to enact a bill calling for assessments. That bill would have to comport with what the constitution says, but if there was no meaning to the term when it was placed in the constitution, there is no standard by which to judge what the Legislature has done. And if it was felt that it was necessary to put into the constitution this type of authority before the Legislature could exercise it without violating some other prohibition in the constitution, I think any such statute would be rendered a nullity because it has no meaning. But why in the world we would want to put into a proposal that is submitted to the public something as poorly written as this LR 29CA would escape me if I hadn't been in the Legislature for so long and had I not seen similar things done. Do you want to know why this will be submitted to the voters? Not because it has merit, but as a favor, more or less, to Senator Pirsch. That's why it will be done. If it is done from the standpoint of merit, those who support it would be able to explain its meaning and its application. Since I know that a lot of people put their names on these things without being aware of even the contents, let alone being able to explain those contents, I would not go down the list of everybody whose name is on here and put to them questions as to what this means. We all, as members of the Legislature, know that these kinds of poor pieces of legislation come before us. I am not even going to ask Senator Momen why, after giving such a complete and thorough reason why nobody should vote for it, he will vote for it because he already told me. He already told me. He cannot bring himself to vote against something that carries the label victims rights. I could have a little fun with Senator Momen if I wanted to, no, not on this. If you have a liquid in a glass and somebody is thirsty and you want them to drink it, let it be clear; don't let it be cloudy and have little things floating around in it or seeming to swim providing their own means of locomotion, unless they are very, very thirsty. Let it be clear. Let it, if they