

describe things that have already been done anyway through the discourse and then you set up the problems, of course. What happens if those arguments are incorrectly done? Obviously intent has nothing to do with most of the constitutional amendments. What happens if, for example, our current Secretary of State I'm sure that he is extremely competent although there are days that make me nervous about him, but...no, he's a good friend of mine, just for the record to reflect that, and I would just tell you that what happens if the Secretary of State does not accurately describe those cons or those pros? And do you set up some sort of mechanism or is this purely just for information, and even if it's bad information, it doesn't make any difference. My preference has always been to leave those descriptions out, but they look good, but in fact, when you hand those out to people they'll look at them and say, well this is nice, and they throw them away and off you go. Philosophically, I would take those out, Senator, but is it your intent with this amendment there would be 250 words pro and 250 words on the con? At least that would expand it. Is that what you're clarifying or are you clarifying it to narrow it?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, my intention wasn't to narrow or to expand, but to merely make clear what I thought it was that the green copy drafters intended. So, basically, the effect of the amendment is to limit to 250 words all of the pro arguments taken together and to limit to 250 words all of the con arguments taken together.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: So for a total of 500 words about the entire subject?

SENATOR BEUTLER: I assume the argument is that people are only going to read so much so what are the best 250 words you have to say about it.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I suppose if you were for it, you would say vote for this, this is good policy;; if you're against it, this is terrible policy, vote against it and that might be the extent. That helps me. I'm going to spend a little bit of time and my time is probably running out, 'o speak with Senator Schimek and I appreciate that, Senator Beutler. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Beutler.