

The senator who brought this amendment knows that we are talking about housas. She has got somebody over there whispering in her ear telling her what to do but they don't give her the whole story before they send her in here with a cock-and-bull amendment like this. That's why she can't answer the question. He didn't tell her the answer. You are dealing with people's residences. A home is not a polling place. Under the constitution, a person has the right to freely traverse the streets and sidewalk of any city. Under this cockamamie amendment, if a person is soliciting or polling, now I don't know what solicitation refers to, but whatever they are soliciting, they don't even know whether a person is in that house who is a registered voter. So a person could be charged with a crime without even knowing that a crime is being committed without intending to commit it. You don't know whether the house has a registered voter. Then to go on with the silliness of this, in line 9, it talks about this prohibition extending until the time the registered voter votes. How do you know when that person has voted? Does that person tell everybody I have voted. Do you have to put a sign out there? Can you see the silliness, when these right-wingers bring this kind of stuff in here, and there are people on this floor who wants to call somebody a liberal because of their point of view. At least the liberals don't come in here with this sheerly, this sheer stupid right-wing nonsense. You can't walk in front of a person's house without running the risk of committing a crime; going to equate a person's house with the public schools; equate a person's home with a polling place. Now let me tell you something else, and she won't answer the question, I can't get it from her, so I am going to ask the question and answer it. Senator Chambers, based on your understanding of this that Senator Witek is offering, could this language apply to a family member? Well, I think maybe it could. Senator Chambers, you have to speak up please, we can't hear you. I am sorry, I will speak up, I will speak louder. Yes, it could involve a family member. Well, Senator Chambers, why do you say it could involve a family member? Because in line 2, the language says no person shall do any of these things, and a family member is a person. Well, Senator Chambers, does that mean that if a person is a registered voter, he or she in discussing these issues or trying to influence a vote could be committing a crime? That's certainly true. Yes, my answer is, that's certainly true, because a family member is a person. Well, Senator Chambers, maybe you are not reading