

in this packet of information we got. Let me read you the second one. Another example of a process amendment is one proposed by former Arizona Governor, Bruce "Babble", Bruce Babbitt, excuse me, at an NGA meeting in 1980. It would give states, by petition of two-thirds of the Legislatures, the power to sunset any federal law except those dealing with defense and foreign affairs. Such an amendment would be much more radical than the Article V amendment, but discussion of it at the Conference of States would certainly get the attention of Congress, and it would get the attention of anybody who would want to ridicule and show that this is a lot of crazy silliness going on. Why should the states be able to nullify an act of Congress anymore than a group of county boards should be able to nullify a statute enacted by the Legislature? That is the craziness that they are going to propose and discuss. Now, I cannot determine what the outcome of any vote on this floor is going to be because I only have one vote, but my one vote can be in the column to show what my attitude toward all this was. The only two areas, remember, where the states could not nullify an act of Congress would be in the area of defense and foreign affairs. What about taxation? What about interstate commerce? What about federal subsidies to farm programs? Suppose there are insufficient states to support a subsidy program that Congress puts in place and the other states say, we're tired of giving these mooching, sponging, ne'er-do-well farmers all this money and they vote to nullify that. What then becomes of Nebraska's going along with it? But I think even people in Nebraska would be too smart for something like this. Let me knock on wood. (Knocks on wood.) I hope. Now let me get to the third of the Trinity. The Council of State Governments and other task forces have recommended that a sentence be added to the Tenth Amendment, again to the U.S. Constitution, clearly stating that the courts have responsibility to adjudicate the boundaries between national and state authority. The courts, now some people have followed the attempt to have an adjudication made of the boundary between Nebraska and Iowa, and that cannot be satisfactorily done. So if the courts cannot satisfactorily adjudicate the boundary between two states, how is it going to deal with that much more fluid, far less defined boundary between federal and state authority? Do you think the federal courts are going to say that the states, because some silliness by state representatives would lead them to say it, on an equal footing with the federal government? There is no way that the states are on an equal footing, there is no way that they should be placed on that footing. And I...