

of time during which he or she can rescind the contract without penalty. So you have more rights under the Commercial Code than she'd have under the good graces of the Legislature. But in this instance it makes me think of something that happened in England. I think it may have been about 1688, and, Senator Jensen, don't hold me to this date, but it was when Parliament was assuming some new prerogatives and I think that was the year they swore some kind of eternal allegiance to William and Mary or two people who were ruling at that time and said that certain rights would never belong to the citizens of England, either now or any time in the future. They bound themselves and their descendents forever. Thomas Paine didn't like this and he saw it as a dispute between the living and the dead. He said the only ones, and I'm paraphrasing to the best of my recollection, it's been a long time ago, the only ones who should have a say so as to how they shall be governed and the types of laws which shall govern them are the living. If you have existing laws and existing constitutional provisions and the living do not choose to alter them, by failing to alter them the living have given their ongoing consent to be so governed. But it is totally inappropriate and there is no place from which such authority would be derived by which you would say dead people have put in place a law which shall forever bind the living, and the living cannot change those laws. It's a situation where once those who are here have gone to the other place wherever that is, they have no further interest in the affairs of this world. They can dispose of their goods, provided they comply with the law in terms of writing a valid will. But when it comes to disposing of the interests of a living person, I don't think that what somebody says in a will should have any impact whatsoever. The child is not property. Goods and property are disposed of by way of a will. I cannot dispose of anything by a will in which I don't have a direct property interest. If children are to be reduced to the level of property...

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** One minute.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** ...in the same why, by analogy, that a birth mother who signs a document is stripped of her personhood and humanity, then we ought to take everything in 712 and put it in an appropriate part of the Uniform Commercial Code. Senator Beutler is probably trying to make an unclear thing less unclear. This whole concept of disposing of a child by devise is abhorrent to me for whatever reason. So I'm not going to be able to support Senator Beutler's amendment, and I wish that