

idea of having a Conference of the States to deal with all of these radical ideas about how we could change the structure, I've moved from that position to being one that thinks that some of these ideas are not good ones and would not like to see those brought back, become part of the Constitution. I think the best way to prevent that from happening, however, is for us, as a state, to send a delegation to The Conference of the States and to express those viewpoints. Senator Chambers, you were asking for a definition of supermajority, I would agree with you that there is not one in the resolution. I have distributed an amendment, AM1154, which would talk about what would cons...what would have to happen for this conference to include a constitutional amendment within its petition. And by my amendment, we would be requesting that the rules of The Conference of the State include a provision that two-thirds of those voting would have to support this constitutional amendment, and that that two-thirds vote would have to constitute a majority of all of the states. That may or may not be a good idea. It's something I am proposing that may or may not be an idea that's applicable to other parts of this process also. The one thing, I guess, I would like to try to clarify for members of the body is this whole concept of how the Constitution, how the United States Constitution is amended and how this Conference of the States would interact with that. First of all, I think it's clear...I think everybody on the floor of the Legislature has hopefully by now bought into the idea that this Conference of the States will not, in and of itself, transform itself into a constitutional convention. I think we've talked about that a number of times, we've put specific language into the amendment and even people that are opposed to the LR 16 agree with that, that it cannot. I think the concern is from...that I hear from Senator Witek and Senator Chambers and some concern that I share is that the ideas generated at this conference could...could develop a life of their own and ultimately become amendments to the U.S. Constitution. And the specific idea we're taking about today is this idea of states sunsetting federal laws when two-thirds of them would vote to do that. Could discuss how that isn't really the historical view of...historical view of nullification was that any state could, by simply passing a resolution, indicate that any act passed by Congress was not applicable within that state. And this is a slightly different concept than that, and that's why the idea whether Ben Nelson used the word nullify or Mike Leavitt used the word nullify, it's really not applicable. The point I wanted to get to though, before I got carried away