

constitution. I ask you today, who is to judge what is suitable for a constitution? Each one of us as individuals have to decide that. It is not a question of law per se. Many of these things are optional, one way or the other. It is a question of value judgments. Where do you place your sense of value?

Is it because of the number of people who are affected? I have to disagree with my good friend, Delegate Smith, on this when he says that it is too particularized. All of us are consumers, I submit. We were talking before about special groups, farmers, lumbermen, miners. We are all consumers. There is no reference to a particular religion or economic status. I disagree somewhat with Delegate Koger. This protects the rich as well as the poor man. I make reference to Delegate Case's remarks when he said that many people were swindled by savings and loan scandals. People had hundreds of thousands of dollars, not just the poor man. Would it be better for us to spell it out, paragraph by paragraph, ten or twelve pages? We do not need that. We need a clear mandate to the legislature that we believe this is important enough for them to take specific action. The principle is certainly involved and I am for the principle.

Something for the people, we have heard said, and I believe this is something for the people, people who are not so concerned with unicameralism or bicameralism, whether there will be four tiers or three tiers, but people who are concerned that there is a clear enunciation of the right of citizens to enjoy protection from unscrupulous and unfair business practices that have been defined in many court decisions.

The interpretation is elastic. That is the way it should be. I say the savings and loans of the past, existing financing practices, so-called debt management, food and meat inspection of an intrastate nature, unscrupulous sales in many areas, do a discredit to the business community of legitimate business men who want this kind of protection, as evidenced by a recent editorial over the weekend. This is not figured by any legitimate businessman. The people want it.

I wish to commend the legislature for their past acts and to remind them of their continuing responsibility in this field.

Let's give the people the benefit of the doubt, if there is any doubt as to whether this should be included in the constitution.

We were told we should not hold out a promise to them. I believe we should hold out a promise to them, that the Constitution is designed to hold promises for the future, as well as past accomplishments.

I say set goals that can be reached, maybe general, maybe vague, but I am convinced the truth in finding is seeking and this Convention should set goals which the electorate will accept at the polls and that is the reason I am voting for this proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate Schneider?

DELEGATE SCHNEIDER: Mr. Chairman, I would not rise to speak to this proposition except for the fact that 21 of us voted against the natural resources proposal. I felt very strongly in favor of natural resources and preservation thereof and I feel very strongly in favor of consumer protection, but I do not feel in favor of putting toothless provisions in our constitution just because we agree on policy.

I imagine we could come up with several hundred policy statements and things we think are good in nature and good policy, but to start putting all these in the constitution would lead us to a constitution which is so long it will read like a dictionary. Furthermore, if we do not also put in these other policy considerations, does that not mean perhaps that by exclusion we think they are less important? I do not think many of these other things are less important.

I really think that this is something which, if we are going to put anything in at all about consumer protection, we had better be specific. A little specific language rather than simply a general exhortatory phrase of our policy and our concern with consumer protection would be far more valuable.

I am sure that the legislature is well aware that the public does not like deceptive packaging, deceptive pricing, tainted meats or anything of that nature. It would be completely ridiculous if the public were in favor of these things. I do not think the legislature needs us to put a provision in the constitution to give them any guidance. I would vote against this for that reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bennett?

DELEGATE BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Convention, I suppose we are debating here a fundamental principle of constitutional drafting. We are