

not bracket it. And then let us take a vote and indefinitely postpone it. Then we know that we are through with it, because if you remember early on in the session, it was indefinitely postponed. Then it was revived and each time the thing shows that it may be a dead horse by appearances but the old nag has more lives than a cat, and it manages to come back whinnying and kicking up its heels, and I would like to dispatch it and send it to the glue factory once and for all. So I am saying we should not accept this bracketing motion. We should just vote to indefinitely postpone and I will not extend the debate on the issue.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT: The Chair would thank the members in the gallery for their interest in their legislation. It really is against our rules to have open demonstrations and I would just remind you of that most kindly. We really do have to conduct our debate here with the least amount of audible demonstration from the public. The motion is to bracket the bill and we will have to go ahead with this motion as long as it is on the floor. In the order of procedure, the motion mentioned by Senator Chambers may be taken up later if it is still there to be considered. I will go through my list of names here in accordance with their listing if you wish to speak on the bracketing motion. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President, members, I would oppose the bracket motion, perhaps for a different reason than Senator Chambers, but similar in some respects. My concern is exactly why Senator DeCamp is proposing to bracket and that is because it would jeopardize the petition process to totally repeal Initiative 300. I do not want to provide any more fodder or any more assistance to that effort than possible, and I think that this Legislature had discussed some options in amending LR 16 which dealt with particularly the ag problem, the trust problem, and the authorized ag authorities which Senator Vickers is going to propose, which were all agreed to by proponents of Initiative 300, at least not opposed by those individuals including myself, which would make Initiative 300 a better piece of legislation, and perhaps alleviate some of the fears and concerns some people have. But what is obviously happening is that those people that want to see it repealed, do not want to see it improved. They don't want to have a situation where some of the points of contention are resolved, so that we ease up the frustration out there with some of the particular problem areas. They want it in as bad a shape as possible so that it helps