

to go back to things the way they were, we're asking to go back to the numbers. We don't particularly want to change the language. And Senator Hall's amendment would put back in effect electors which doesn't quite cut it. They're supposed to be called registered voters. So I will stand in opposition to Senator Hall's amendment and I've been trying to think of the proper adjective to describe what Senator Bernard-Stevens has been saying but I just haven't thought of it yet, but I'll try to come up with it before we're through. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, for once I'm going to stay on the amendment which is before us and that amendment is the one being offered by Senator Hall. Nobody yet has given a good argument against adopting Senator Hall's amendment. Senator Bernard-Stevens, it would be a good idea to accept Senator Hall's amendment, then that will be what is before us. We would then discuss whether or not we want to go back to the old way, despite what Senator Dierks just said or accept the changes in LR 6CA. I disagree with Senator Bernard-Stevens that votes for cloture are not here. They'd vote cloture just to get rid of the issue if we go on long enough and I might want to check that out just to see, but I don't care if nothing passes. I like a higher number of required signatures. What I'm going to offer is an amendment that would strike initiative and referendum from the Constitution and all references to those terms from the Constitution. What chance would it have of being adopted? None. Who would vote for it, moi, I would. But there are senators who agree with me. But this is one of those situations where despite the agreement there is fear about how the public will perceive what our vote would mean. I don't believe the public is informed. Senator Beutler said he thinks they are, that they've done a good job when they have amended the Constitution and he mentioned term limits with which he disagrees. If Senator Beutler read what they put in that petition and have added to the Constitution, he would say that his tongue should have cleaved to the roof of his mouth and those words never been uttered when he sees what they put. There is a difference between general language which I think ought to be used in a Constitution, an incoherent, contradictory, unintelligible, inconsistent language. Senator Beutler, they refer within their provision that they added to the Constitution to sections of the Constitution that don't even