

about right now is quite similar to the amendment we worked on yesterday afternoon that Senator Beutler had. The difference is we've changed the date from January 1 to January 2, the time that the two-tiered system would take effect. I think that there were several people who were missing yesterday who indicated that they would support the amendment and I wanted to give them the opportunity to help me do that. This is the same amendment that Senator Beutler had. It does the same thing except that it changes the date of the effectiveness of when the two-tier would go into effect which would be like January 2 of 1999. What we do with this amendment I'd like to make a very brief synopsis of what it does and I hope that doesn't take a whole lot of discussion this morning. I would like to think we can get over this fairly quickly. What it does is put in place the original LR 6CA that I introduced last year and this would be to restore the numbers, the numbers that we are dealing with in the petition drive process to the original figures that they were before Senator Hall's amendment or Senator Hall's bill in 1990, '89 or '90, whenever that was and also to the understanding that the Secretary of State had prior to the Supreme Court decision last July. It does that simply based on the constitutional amendment change, would require petition signatures in the amount of 10 percent of who those voted in the last Governor's election. It's just that simple. The thing that I think we accomplish by this is we allow people to do the petition drives the way that they were accustomed to doing it, the way that had been in place for them to do it all these years for two years and at that time it gives us the opportunity to check with the Supreme Court, find out from the Supreme Court whether the two-tier system is constitutional. I think it's that simple. One of the problems I have with the bill as it is now without this amendment is that with the two-tier system in effect, we think that that's suspect constitutionally. So if someone is out there doing a petition drive next year after this has been passed the next year, after this bill has been accepted by the people at the ballot in 1996, if it is accepted the way that it is drafted right now, then it is subject to the interpretation by the Supreme Court and if there is a petition drive going on at that time, the Supreme Court comes back with a decision that says that this is not constitutional, then those people who have gone through this effort to do a petition drive have gone to this effort for nothing because that stops everything and we go back to what is in effect right today. I don't think it's fair to our constituents to ask them to go through that sort of a situation again. I don't think it's fair