

now only have the option of calling a constitutional convention to propose amendments. The thought is that the uncertainty of a convention could be avoided by allowing three-fourths of state legislatures to propose an amendment to the Constitution that would become valid unless rejected by two-thirds of Congress. If they strike out the two-thirds of Congress, then...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR WITEK: ...three-fourths of the states can amend the Constitution of the United States. This, I believe, is what they're really proposing here. It has nothing to do with mandates. Don't let it get confused or wrought up in mandates or any of these other things. What they intend to do is to call for structural changes in these areas and I would ask that you put this safeguard in saying you can talk about any constitutional changes you want, but in this petition that they're going to bring back to ratify to the states, they will not include changes to the Constitution of the United States. That's all this amendment is going to do. It's not going to keep anybody from talking. It's just going to say when you put this document, when you put this action plan together, when you put this other document together, you're not going to propose changes to the Constitution as Governor Nelson and others have already said they intend to do. So I would ask that you make or give very serious consideration to my amendment to put it into this resolution unless you want to streamline that process to the constitutional change. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Witek. Senator Chambers, followed by Senators Abboud and Schimek.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, what I had been looking at is a way to amend Senator Witek's amendment, but since hers is an amendment to the committee amendment, I cannot do that. But if she would agree, then what I would ask her to do, and I'd come over and work with her on it, is to make a clean, take a clean copy of the amendment she is offering, make the changes on it and if she would agree to it, then she could offer it as a substitute for hers which is pending and I will tell you what the difference is. It may look like it's mere semantics, but it's not. And I think it would go to what Senator Witek wants to do. In her amendment, she says the action plan shall not include any proposed changes to the Constitution and then in line 5 there would not be the inclusion