

propositions continue to increase, as they have recently, as more and more of those are funded by monied interest and by monied interest outside the state, we will want to have in-state representatives of the people offering them an alternative. I don't see this as paternalistic in any way. Why is it that offering the people, generally, of the state an additional alternative is paternalistic? It's only paternalistic if you make the assumption that the initiatives represent a majority of the people of the state; more often than not they have not. Does an initiative, for example, coming from Mr. Jaksha represent the people of the state? I don't know how many initiatives he's had, but I think all of them, except for the last one where he was in conjunction with other groups with respect to term limits, all of them have been defeated soundly by the people of the state. The fact of the matter is that with money paying petitioners the people, many of the people behind initiative campaigns are not representing the state nearly as much as you and I are, and we know that. And it seems to me that it's our obligation, not a paternalistic sentiment, but our obligation to present to people our best thought on a particular issue, and there's nothing wrong with presenting them our best thought. Delay of a year? What's so bad about delay of a year? You know it used to be our Constitution only got changed once every two or three years, now it gets changed every election, three or four times. In fact, you know, it may well be that if you had this amendment it would discourage people...it would encourage people to change the statutes more often and not the Constitution so much. But we ought to be real careful about changing the Constitution. What's wrong with a little thought? If it takes away passion and emotion, it's not taking it away at the critical time, because the critical time is when the petitions are getting signed. It's not keeping anything off the ballot. It's just suggesting that in some instances there may be a better way, and I would think the people of the state would want to have the benefit of more than one option in situations where there was more than one reasonable option. It just strikes me as curious, I guess, that certain people who come in here and lobby on behalf of initiative petitions, people you and I can name, somehow they've self-appointed themselves as the representatives of democracy, and in fact, in many cases, they are no such thing, they're no such thing. And why is it that our opinion is somehow...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.