

way it was for purposes of interpretation, not actual language. What folks have talked about is making sure, or trying to ensure that the signature limits or requirements rather, are roughly the same as they were prior to that decision. I don't believe, and I apologize, Senator Beutler, I did not look and I was hoping that you could reference it...

SENATOR BEUTLER: The language, Senator, is on 1254 and it's exactly the same language that would pertain under the current bill in the event that the two-tier system were rejected by the court.

SENATOR HALL: So it is the same language that is under the current bill. It is not the same language that was in the Constitution prior to the '88 amendment?

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's right.

SENATOR HALL: So it is not the pre-'88 language. Is that correct?

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's right.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you. So in other words, we're not really going back to the old language and I mean we hear about that and I rise in opposition to Senator Beutler's amendment because there's much discussion about wanting to go back to that, the old language that was in the Constitution and I don't believe that no one wants to go back. I don't want to go back to the old language. There was a good, valid reason for why we changed that. Everyone was under the opinion that we needed to change the Constitution because of problems that were involved in the petition process. Do you remember the failed lottery act? That's where that constitutional amendment came from. The whole rewrite of 716, the bill that changed the initiative petition efforts was, came about because of problems that volunteer efforts, some quasi paid efforts ran afoul of the laws and they were found to be in violation thereof. Many people who ran those volunteer efforts admitted that if they too had been caught, so to speak, they would...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...could and would have been charged and would have been guilty of the same types of infractions. So we really