

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

January 13, 2004 LR 4

of cowardice, where people ought to show backbone, there was a discussion about people obtaining second opinions from physicians when an operation was recommended, or a radical treatment of some kind. The host of the program said, well, do people feel that seeking a second opinion will hurt the first doctor's feelings? And this lady who was talking, and I think she herself was a physician, said, what people need to understand is that they are trying to seek the best, most appropriate treatment for themselves, and not to placate their doctor. The doctor is there to serve them and not the other way around, so they should definitely seek a second opinion. If there are people outside this Legislature who do not understand the significance, dignity and majesty of a constitution, their ignorance should not overshadow this Legislature and cause us to reflect that ignorance. Our job is to bring understanding. We are behaving most in accord with what a public official should do when we educate the people, when we explain things to them, when we let them know what government is about and distinguish for them the different levels of importance of various activities. And when it comes to our lawmaking, our recommending things to the public for placement into the constitution as an amendment to the constitution, we should be deliberative, we should deal with issues of weight and merit, and if, as in the case of Senator Schrock's bill, there is an alleged attempt to address a problem, the first thing that should be established is that there is in fact a problem. Senator Schrock admits there's not and, yet, these senators here are just running along behind him like sheep, saying, some people out there want this so do it, telling the Legislature that you should be as silly and lacking in knowledge as they are. But maybe some of my colleagues don't understand what the constitution is. Maybe they swore an oath to uphold a document whose contents they don't even understand or appreciate. Here's what my amendment says, because I think the text of it should be in the transcript, and what we're doing here today should be available for people in the future to look at and evaluate. In Senator Schrock's bill, his proposed amendment, you would strike the words "fish, trap and." Then insert the following words: "for a way to protect the Constitution from frivolous amendments." Then the following words are stricken: "subject to reasonable restrictions as prescribed by law." And this is the