

the existing constitutional provisions providing for initiative and referendum. So if somebody were to read this language, they first open the constitution, they see that these two rights are guaranteed to the populace, initiative and referendum, and they are self-executing. Then they'll see this language. This language...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...does not repeal referendum and initiative, and they'll scratch their head, and they'll say, I don't get it. Frankly, I don't get it. So maybe Senator Dierks has had one of those bursts of inspiration that has been denied to the rest of us and I hope that when he speaks this next time he will explain, in much more detail and with much greater precision what his amendment does instead of saying, I'm not sure whether it's necessary, I'm not sure what it will do, because I'm not sure what these proposals are doing. That's not good enough. If he can persuade me that anything that is before us now would strike from the constitution the rights of initiative and referendum, I would give consideration to what he's offering. That failing, it...if this were April 1st I would say he's showing...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...a sense of humor that I didn't know he had.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Are there any other lights on, Senator?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, there are.

SENATOR DIERKS: Okay. I'm not exactly sure what Senator Chambers was saying about clarity and precision, but...and I'm not sure what sort of challenge he's looking for. I think I've stated it about as clearly as I can that I'm not interested in cluttering up the language of the constitution. I think we can do that...we provide enough clutter to the constitution with the entire piece of legislation. And the three words that I'm going to add to it ain't going to make that much difference. Those are...the three lines that I'm going to want to put in there are not going to make that much difference. The intent is very