

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

March 5, 2003 LR 11

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schimek, would you answer that question about the language that I'm attempting to strike? Why is that language a part of this proposed constitutional amendment?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Senator Chambers, that's a fair question. And I know where you're going with this, and I'll answer the unasked question first. It's probably not absolutely necessary to this constitutional amendment. And I know how you like to have tight constitutional language. I think it was part of a larger discussion, to make certain that everybody understood that the tribes were not going to be left out. And that's why we put it in there. So I don't think that it necessarily needs to be in there. So if you feel strongly about it, I wouldn't have any objection to it.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Schimek. I will now put the same question to Senator Janssen.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If that language that I want to strike is stricken, it won't hurt anything, will it?

SENATOR JANSSEN: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Janssen. I'm going to listen to the discussion, and see if anybody can show me a compelling reason why we need that. And Senator Schimek touched on it. I wasn't even going to get as deeply involved in this matter as I've gotten. But if something is going to go into the constitution, I think it ought to be language which says what we want to say. There should be no surplusage. If we can say it in two words and say everything that needs to be said, use two words. Any time you put additional language into the constitution, the court is going to say, every phrase, every clause, every word in a constitution must be given meaning. If the Legislature proposes a constitutional amendment, the court is even stronger in insisting that something was meant by those words. If, on the other hand, the language results from a