

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, they violated part of the constitution. Well with this law they have violated state law here.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, the Governor has done both, with reference to enforcing laws, and that doesn't make anybody any different. So, why should we put a higher standard on...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...these people than we do on others? What I'm really trying to get to, if somebody is not complying with the constitution there is legal action that can be taken to force that compliance, isn't that correct?

SENATOR DIERKS: Yes, I think so.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, now we are putting an additional possibility for punishment which would exist simply for not having filed a report.

SENATOR DIERKS: Yes, it deals with...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, and since my time is out, I don't want to ask you something else that we can't complete, but I'll turn on my light again.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Elmer, you are recognized to speak.

SENATOR ELMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. Senator Hillman, as well as the rest of our membership, is well aware that I am an individual that believes in portions of Initiative 300, but not in others. And, if we are going to have a constitution that contains these corporate farming restrictions we should have a method for the Attorney General or the Secretary of State to find out if the constitution is being violated. So, to that extent, this is probably a proper thing to do. As far as Senator Hillman's amendment to the Dierks amendment, if we are going to accomplish what the bill purported to do in committee, then it should be retained, in my opinion, because corporations and their principals, as time passes, change, partnerships, activity and the people that are actually carrying out the work change. So, a regular report, to see if people are complying, is probably proper, if we are going to enforce the constitution of our state and the statutes of it.