

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President and members, this issue was brought before us before on a very close vote and I think we made the wrong decision yesterday to allow Senator DeCamp's LR 16 to have only 25 votes to be revived. That was a serious mistake we made and I think we ought to correct it at this time and set the precedent again as it has been over the years that a resolution is considered as a bill when it deals with the Constitution. There was a rule change submitted by Senator Morehead, Senator Beutler and myself to make that very clear but in lieu of that rule change which will take some time to process, I would ask you to uphold the Chair's ruling. If you do not do so, you essentially respond with the Constitution Committee being in a situation where killing resolutions allows only a 25 vote margin by this body to bring those out of that committee out after killing them and all other committees would require 30 votes when a bill is killed. And so the situation is you consider constitutional amendments much more easily than you do other bills and you consider the Constitution Committee much different than any other committees when we take action in that committee. And I suggest to you that is exactly the opposite position you should take. Constitutional amendments should be more difficult to pass, not easier to pass. You should make it more difficult to revive a killed amendment, not more easy to revive a dead amendment from a committee. In both cases it makes no sense whatsoever that we would take that position. Now I understand many of you felt emotionally involved with the particular proposal from Senator DeCamp dealing with Initiative 300 but I ask you to put aside the issue at hand, whether we are dealing with LR 16 or dealing with LR 33 and how you might feel about those resolutions as secondary. What you should consider is in the eyes of the public and in the eyes of the state what is the better policy in terms of dealing with these constitutional amendments? And in my estimation you can hardly go back to the people and say, well, it should be easier to deal with constitutional amendments than it should be to deal with bills. Ask yourself how the public will respond to that and I think you will find that they would say that that is completely wacko. You ought to deal with constitutional amendments much more seriously and with much more concern than you would a bill because a constitutional amendment is a far more serious change in our state than a bill would be. So I would ask you to again consider the