

it's one that the citizens would have no problem living with or living within. Think about it. We change the constitution, we're here trying to do that today. We meet no more than roughly five months in the longest session that we're in, the one that we're currently in this year. We'll meet in the short session, for approximately three and a half calendar months, but we change the constitution through this process, which can be, I would argue, more arduous than the petition effort. To say that the issue should be addressed within a specific time frame, that as proposed in Senator Wesely's amendment, six months, would literally mirror the amount of time that the Legislature has to do that same task. Now, these issues can lay over to the following year, but the same could hold true, actually a petition effort under the Wesely amendment could fail and be tried again within the same calendar year: It could very likely be an issue that could be addressed more than once. And does this then mean with the adoption of the Bernard-Stevens amendment that if there is a flaw in that constitutional change, that that group has to wait until that year runs out for purposes of making a new effort before they can take those petitions out again? I guess that's a question that I have for Senator Bernard-Stevens, possibly it doesn't apply. But with the six-month time frame you, basically, say to folks, look, this issue has to be addressed. The example that's been given time and time again is the one that is the most recent change with regard to the term limits. It was done in approximately, I think, 40 days, if I'm not mistaken. It was done in short order without any problem at all. We had the ability to hire paid circulators. This is another control, if you will, on that capacity for people to basically hire the rewriting of the State's Constitution, and that's really what it amounts to. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that that's within their rights, but the fact of the matter is the legislatures have the ability, where they're allowed the initiative petition process and referendum processes at the various states that have those, to set the standards by which that is done. We can do that within the constitution. And I believe that the Wesely amendment that puts a six-month time frame or limitation on any effort that has to begin and end within that period is a very appropriate one when you look at the time frames that we work within. I think that it is very fair to allow for that type of a proposal. I think the Bernard-Stevens amendment that extends it to a full year is one that goes beyond what needs to be available for purposes of the issue. If the issue is important enough that it should be allowed to be voted on by the people to