

SENATOR DIERKS: Nobody.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR DIERKS: I asked myself.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. And he and "hissself" agree. But, members of the Legislature, anything that's added to a constitution...a proposed constitutional amendment and which is adopted, if the amendment passes, that language becomes a part of the constitution. That language becomes a part of the constitution. I have said repeatedly on this floor on other issues, when attempts were made to amend the constitution, that I don't think the document should be cluttered with unnecessary language. I don't think it should be cluttered with language which is inappropriate for a constitution. I have opposed putting into the constitution that laundry list of so called victims' rights. The body, a majority agreed that that kind of nonsense should be in the constitution. I think this is as nonsensical as that language and it has no place in the constitution. When it comes to trying to defend the integrity of that document what I have to say does not carry much weight with this body, but I do want it in the record for future reference. This language does not accomplish anything. It would be like adding to every bill that we put into the statutes this provision of law does not repeal any other provision of law other than the provision of law which it declares that it is repealing, which is using a lot of words to say nothing. I hope that the body will reject this amendment. What is being offered thus far is not going to repeal from the constitution or strike from the constitution the rights of initiative and referendum. Sometimes it is good to have nonlawyers discussing issues because they bring that point of view of a layperson. People trained in the law often can become deeply involved in technicalities, as they're called, and details. Those details are essential when we finally enact a piece of legislation. But during the discussion along the way it is good and it is wholesome to have the position of the layperson articulated and put into the record so that it's clear that those things were considered when we enacted a law. But when time comes to put things into the constitution, that which to a layperson might be called common sense is to somebody who wants to protect the constitution nonsense. This amendment, if adopted, and if the proposal to the constitution to which it is attached should be adopted, that language would be in the constitution along with