

will be the opportunity to evaluate these proposals, and I don't see anything wrong with allowing that period of time for discussing a change to the Constitution. I don't know whether Senator Beutler was being symbolic when he selected nine months because that is the average gestational period for the bringing into the world of a human being. In a way, it's bringing into the world, or attempting to do so into the political world of Nebraska a brand new addition to the family of the Constitution, and I think it is not too long a period of time. There is an eagerness on the part of some members of the body to have a bill, any kind of bill, that seems to make it easier to amend the Constitution. I know that Senator Dierks has somebody in his district who is really heated up about this and I can understand when the spurs are applied that the steed will move faster; sometime it will buck. I am the kind, who allowing myself to be analogized in that manner; if spurs are applied to me, I am going to get rid of the one who is putting the spurs to me. Others who are more amenable to that kind of prodding will just run faster. We should not run in haste to amend the Constitution. I listened to what Senator Dierks said, and I didn't hear a single argument against the wisdom of doing this. I didn't hear a single argument by him showing the wisdom of keeping the present system where you have an indefinite period of time to circulate these petitions and then a relatively short period of time before it is actually placed on the ballot. Before it is placed on the ballot, it is just something out there being circulated, talked about, and it may never come to fruition in terms of a proposition that will be submitted to the voters. When Senator Beutler brings us a proposal like this, I wish that we would be able to look at what the proposal says, and then argue for or against it on that basis, instead of saying that the present way is the way it has always been or the old way was better than the present way and we need to go back to the old way because it was there for such a long time. That is not a good argument. I am going to listen because I think Senator Dierks may give us some additional enlightenment, and I want to be fair in having my mind open to what he says, but thus far, I haven't heard from him what I consider an argument even.

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** One minute.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** Senator Beutler has given a rationale for what it is he is doing. His rationale has been persuasive to me. The first time this idea was broached, I rejected it out of hand, and I have to say that I had not really thought it through