

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

February 28, 2005 LR 8

adopted. I do raise the call. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, a priority motion: Senator Chambers would move to reconsider the vote just taken.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, you're recognized to open on your reconsideration motion.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, we're going to be on this bill a long time and people may as well get an idea of how it goes when you get engaged in extended debate. But you're going to notice the difference between me and some of the incompetents who might try to do it. I'm not going to read from a telephone book. I'm not going to just tell jokes. I'm going to talk about some things of substance that need to be in the record, whether anybody on this floor understands, whether anybody on this floor appreciates it. But I have to start with a mea culpa. Brothers and sisters of the Legislature, I have sinned; forgive me. I do not want anything that I offer to be a part of this atrocity unless it's one of my other amendments which will show the silliness of what we're doing. This amendment is one that would improve the language that you have been presented. That's why I don't want you to accept it. Why was it the first of my offered amendments? To show you that you all do not read when you sign your name to something. Because you have a short attention span, or something is wrong with you, let me read all that you had to concentrate on to realize it had a problem, not pages and pages, not even a whole page, not half a page, not a quarter of a page, not a fifth of a page. You didn't even have to go to the backside of the page, as you usually do, and this is what you could not analyze: "Fishing, trapping, and hunting are a valued part of the heritage of the people and will be a right forever preserved for the people subject to reasonable restrictions as prescribed by law." That's all. So why do I, who am opposed to it, come up with an amendment and the very first one is actually an improvement on what was offered? To show you how little regard you all have for your constitution. We keep hearing people say, and we're probably going to hear it more and more because there is no substantive reason to support this thing, that they don't see any mischief in it. If it's poorly drafted, isn't that