

can agree to disagree on this. Even though it's emotional, I seem to find that even more so than some other emotional issues, like the death penalty and abortion and whatever, I have constituents that just refuse to talk to me on this. I think that is unfortunate. I can put myself in their place and see where they want to lash out in revenge at somebody. The big corporations are an easy target. But we, here, have to see the big picture, the statewide picture. I think that is what we are not looking at, or we haven't so far. The first general statement, people have spoken on this, leave it alone. Senator Vard Johnson made that. Well, we stand for retention or rejection every four years. Some people would like to go give Senator DeCamp and myself our report cards at the next election, I'm sure of that. Just because they voted for us four years ago doesn't mean they want to again. The Constitution isn't sacred. Sure, the people voted it in, but they might want a chance to reconsider and have a little more debate and dialogue on the subject because a lot of people did not understand it. Twenty-five or 30 of you have your names on constitutional amendments right now from my committee. So it isn't sacred. We can take a look at it. There is nothing wrong with that. If 300 is as good as citizens say it is, they will retain it, if not they will reject it. That is the way the system works. I would emphasize strongly that a lot of people voted on Initiative 300, the first time around, that did not understand the issue. I've done this on several occasions, I'm going to do it one more time. I have here Initiative 300 in its entirety, the 1,800 words. I'm not talking the 40 words that were on the ballot in 1982. Could I see a show of hands of how many of you have read the 1,800 words of Initiative 300, in total? Maybe one-third, maybe a little more. I can't see the folks in the balcony, but you can see each other. I'll ask you honestly, how many of you have read the total 1,800 words? Raise your hands in the balcony if you've read the total 1,800 words in Initiative 300. I see a couple of hands. I want to tell you, good, I want to tell you if you talk to people on the street, you will say, what is Initiative 300? They will say, it's to keep big corporations from owning farmland. Vard Johnson just said that several times, when we, that should know better, say that it's demagoguery, and there is no excuse for saying that because we know that it also keeps little corporations and little partnerships from using farmland. It went way further than anyone intended for it to. To give an example, Senator Jackie Smith and I cannot