

but we're not going to throw everything out with the bath water. If it's unconstitutional, retroactively we'll go back and it will go back to the way that it was. What I would propose to the body, what I hope the body would do is to discuss, if they wish, the committee amendments. But personally I'll be voting against any amendment, whether I agree with them or not on the committee amendments. My hope is let's agree to the committee amendments so that we get a foundation of where we're starting from. And once the committee amendments are agreed to, then let's have at it, let's go with the amendments on the thresholds, let's go with whatever other amendments may be there, but let's give us a basis of which to start from. So I'm hoping that we can simply agree to the committee amendments and then move on and have at it with all of the amendments that may be forthcoming at that point. That's what I'd urge the body to do and I thank the Chair for the time. Senator Schimek, if I have time left, would you like any of my time? I yield back my time.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the body. I rise in opposition to the committee amendments. I think that the committee amendments represent somewhat of a flawed attempt to bring all things to all people. And I don't think we should try that. I believe that what I tried to do was a very simple, straight-forward, bring this back to the way that the statutes or the law existed, the constitutional law existed prior to a change, an inadvertent change on the part of Senator Hall in 1988, and also as a result of some things that the Supreme Court laid on our state and its citizens in July or May of last year, I guess. It's a simple thing, I believe, that we restore to our citizens what they thought was proper and gave them their opportunity to partake in government as we, as the Unicameral have seen to it that they should have. And I would like for us to just go...to go back to where we started with this thing, get that vote back to 10 percent of those who voted in the last Governor's election for constitutional change, and provide for those citizens what they have felt all the time that they should have. I understand some of the frustrations that people have. I understand the thoughts that people have about having higher numbers. I understand the thoughts that they have about using it based on the number of people who are registered to vote rather than those who voted in that last election. What I'm saying is that it's been the way that I asked for it to be in