

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 5, 1999

LR 18

criticize the unicameral system, by the way, from comments I've heard as we...gets discussed at various times, say we don't have the check and balance in here with the two-house system and, in a sense, we don't have that check. We don't have the check here; then we don't have it for our constitutional amendments. But I, as I sit here thinking about it, to me, it cuts both ways in terms of having two elections. Because not only does it make sure that the idea is good, and if it's good last year it ought to be good next year because it ought...it's prob...excuse me, going to be in the constitution and in our...in our laws for the next hundred years, hundred and fifty years, however long we're going to be going. But the other thing is, to me, it does protect. I really...I'm hesitant. I don't know who Senator Dierks is talking about in his people, because I think his people are our people and they're all over the state, and I think it constitutes a protection for the people, whoever they may be and wherever they are, that there isn't something hastily...hasty pulled on them in an election. I, too, agree am very concerned about buying a constitutional amendment. That's the way to go down in history--simply buy one. And I too have confidence in the people. I think they've not made many mistakes over the hundred and some years that I...and who am I to judge? I understand that. Who am I to judge? But we...we have that protection of the constitution. I think it should be changed but if it's good to change it, it's good to do it slowly and reflectively and gradually, and voting twice to me doesn't look like that is a...any restriction on people's rights. It simply reflects. But I think the most important of all, it's a protection against hasty decisions or a bought constitutional amendment that at least people can reflect on. Because...I mean even...even we've made, maybe not a mistake, but it was misunderstood in the institution of the motor vehicle taxes. In a sense, it slipped through some of us, I...I admit to that, that it only went to schools, counties and cities and not beyond that in the constitution. I recognize that issue, but I had neglected to understand that it was only...it was in the constitution too. So I don't think it hurts to look at that. I assume that there may be some issue that we vote on something and then...the first time, and then when it comes to ratification realize there may be a few words that should be changed that would make it okay, something that's caught after...after being reflected upon, and I don't know whether