

clear. I'm just trying to provide for our citizens their right of petition. And I think that the...in opposi...when you oppose this sort of language it's somewhat amazing to me, because it's an issue that I think is so clearly intended by our constitution that these people have that right, and why shouldn't we just add that language to guarantee that it's going to be there. Like I said before, we don't really know, when this gets to the court, what the court's going to do with it, I wish I could tell you that. I wish we did know, but we just don't. We don't have any idea what's going to happen. And if we can add this little guarantee for our citizens, I think we should do that. I'm glad to respond to any questions that you have, but I guess it's just a simple issue. I think I've stated very simply what we're trying to do. To be any more clear would be hard for me to be that way. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. Senator Dierks, perhaps I can try to add some clarity to what Senator Chambers was trying to discuss. I was trying to follow him as well. But I think here's where my concern comes, that it is so clear in our constitution that the first power reserved to the people is that of initiative. We have not changed that provision in the constitution. That is...that' just paramount, that's the first power that the people get is that power of initiative and certainly that of petitions. If we put this language in, I think it's verbiage, in other words I think it's extra, I don't think it needs to be there. But here's the...and ordinarily I'd say, well maybe there isn't any danger of that occurring, except that what happens if this is read to say the passage of this amendment shall not eliminate any of the powers of initiative and referendum? And the court implies in there that you can't...you can't change anything. And then that's in conflict. What I'm saying is that if you change, for example, the method of a circulator, that change...is that a constitutional power of the initiative and referendum that's protected? I don't know. I think what you want to say is, look, we don't...any amendment that we have here, we don't want to eliminate the power of initiative and petition. And I think that that's so ingrained in the constitution that that is the first power reserved, I'm afraid that by adding sort of the belt and suspender approach, that the court will give some meaning to that suspender and it's going to be an unintended result, and it may be one that you and