

2, line 3, "votes cast" and inserting in lieu thereof "persons qualified to vote"; and by striking out, on page 2, line 7, "60" and inserting in lieu thereof "90".

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has been advised that we have been following the procedure that where one seeks to change one word by unanimous consent it will not be considered as an amendment to the amendment, but will be considered a modification in the original proposal, so that in the absence of objection, the words "persons qualified to vote" will be changed to "registered voters."

DELEGATE STORM: "Registered voters"?

THE CHAIRMAN: "Persons registered to vote," or the word "qualified" will be changed to "registered."

Is there any objection to that change?

*(There was no response.)*

If not, the Chair recognizes Delegate Schloeder, under controlled time.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say at the outset that this Minority Report is meant in no way to reflect upon the work of the Committee. The feeling is that this Committee has labored long and hard and labored ably to come up with a workable and feasible article on suffrage and elections, and on a referendum, particularly.

However, we do reserve the right as a minority to speak to certain points within the Report, and I would like to say that this is not an attempt to gut the referendum procedure.

While it is a fact that increasing the number of signatures is needed, we are adding thirty days for the acquisition of these signatures, and the way it works out is simply this: that the daily average that the Committee would require is 776—excuse me, 766, and the daily average required by our amendment would only add 17 to that total, 783, so I do not think there is a real basic change here.

We are raising the percentage, but we are giving more time to raise those signatures.

Also in our hearings, one of the questions raised, time and time again, was that the entire referendum procedure was a process that was a reflection on the distrust of the representative form of government.

Now, I think that this is not true, and I am a very firm believer and believe basically in the right of direct legislation. However, I feel that criticisms of referendum time and time again went to the ultimate question of suspendability, or suspension; that went to the argument that it was a maneuver in which you could delay legislation, that you could delay the workings of the elected representatives of the people.

To override this criticism we are attempting to keep the referendum strong and viable, but to prevent easy use of suspension, which would make it possible to override the legislature by a small number of people before the greater body of the people had had an opportunity to do just that if they wished.

We feel that this amendment is a strengthening of direct legislation, a strengthening of the popular movement of direct participation in democracy, and is not an attempt again, I repeat, to gut the referendum.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Koss.

DELEGATE KOSS: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates:

I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment. I think it has in it three components: (1) the fact that more time is given; (2) that this makes it more difficult to suspend; and (3) the rationale for tying the number of petition signatures to registered voters. The rationale for tying the figure to registered voters I think can be defended, and in Committee it had a certain degree of appeal. However, we found that in areas where you have had reregistration or canvass that as many as 25 percent of those registered were, in fact, either not resident any longer, or had since died, and should not have actually been included in that. That figure is not only inaccurate, but you are thereby penalizing the circulators of the petition by really denying to them as many, or as much as twenty-five percent of those who might be able to sign the petitions, and I think that this is a snare and delusion.

As far as tying it to the base of registered voters, I think you have to realize that what this does is to require on the basis of the 1966 figures that petitions have to have 70,500 signatures. The Committee recommendation sets the figures at five percent of the votes cast in that 1966 election, which is 46,000, so that the net effect of this is to increase it; and I think to increase it unconscionable.