

people how to keep their marriages intact and why they should compel people to sit down and continue their arguing and disputing under the auspicious of the court. More and more people in politics are facing divorce because we don't know how to maintain a marriage, that is what it comes down to. But then because we have failed so egregiously, so miserably we want to put ourselves in a position, because we have the power to do so, to dictate to other people who are having domestic problems how to solve theirs. Didn't that Jesus to whom these people pray every morning say, physician heal thy self. Doesn't the law say that those who seek equity must do equity and you cannot come to the court of equity with unclean hands. Nobody who has a divorce, nobody who has had a legal separation, nobody who has had a dispute with his or her spouse should be allowed to discuss or offer any of these amendments that are going to dictate the manner in which domestic issues are to be resolved, but then I am a bit more practical and realistic. With that, I feel I have something in common with Machiavelli, whom I discussed earlier. There are those things which are considered nice and proper to be discussed, even though the nice and proper discussion will not get at the truth of these things, which will not get at the reality that exists in the lives of the people that we are going to meddle and intermeddle with. But my amendment, is very realistic, and that is why it is being opposed by Senator Beutler and others. It does not talk about anything in the abstract. It does not talk about anything theoretical. It talks about a concrete harm done by the state to an innocent individual. Senator Pirsch always brings bills or often about victims rights. I see senators pop up on this floor like easy-pop popcorn to support resolutions and other things talking about victims rights when it is a political issue, but when we get to the realistic one of the state creating victims all of them...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...are quiet. I don't see the popping up on the floor of those who support these constitutional amendments about victims rights saying that one victimized by the state is as much a victim and perhaps more so as a person victimized by an individual, and the state has the wherewithal to respond in damages to the harm that it causes. And only through responding in damages can the state attempt to make a person whole. So what my amendment does is to spread the net to enmesh all of