

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 5, 1999

LR 18

of signatures. I think that would be a very difficult and divisive process and I'm not sure that whether the numbers go up or down at this point in time makes a whole lot of difference with the advent of paid petitioners. What does remain is the sanctity of that constitution, how easily can it be changed and how easily should it be changed. If you have some concern that you have a constitutional amendment out there right now and how would this affect that, right now this is set for the general election vote. If there is some interest, that's what I'm...I'm going to try to find out this evening, if there's interest in people who...who want to do this...

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Time.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: ...and there's sufficient numbers, then on Select File I'd make some changes.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Senator Quandahl, followed by Senator Dierks, then Senator Schimek. Senator Quandahl.

SENATOR QUANDAHL: Yes, thank you, Senator Wickersham and the remaining members of the body that are in here. I think it is important and I do have an interest in this particular proposed constitutional amendment and that's not necessarily because I like what it's proposing. As a matter of fact, I was one of the two people in the committee that voted not to advance this out on to the floor. There's a couple of different reasons why I didn't particularly like this constitutional amendment, but I think probably the most basic is, is that I do not think that this proposed constitutional amendment is necessary at this time. To cause or to make it necessary to have multiple votes on a constitutional amendment I think would only serve to confuse the electorate and would no doubt make it harder to get constitutional amendments placed on the ballot and, as a matter of fact, probably passed. Furthermore, the requirement of having two votes for a constitutional amendment doesn't take into consideration the additional cost to the counties and the additional cost to the taxpayers of this state just to try to amend their constitution. And so I would have to say that, again, that this constitutional amendment simply is not necessary. There are safeguards already in place. If there's a particular constitutional amendment that does cause a particular