

not vote to advance all six of those bills. I would not agree to a proposition which would say that there is going to be a vote taken without any discussion and as to demonstrate the point, and Pat, I want to withdraw that motion I made because I didn't know this one that we're dealing with would come up first. I had offered a bill to be taken up and advanced without any debate to try to underline what I'm talking about. I know you wouldn't do it for me. In fact if I were on the desert dying of thirst and most of you had a fifty thousand gallon truck filled with ice water, I wouldn't get a drink of water and I know it, so I don't have any misgivings about my status or lack of status in this body. So since I'm being brutally frank, it may as well be in behalf of the integrity of the legislative process. If people are going to be angry because we do our job the way we're supposed to do it, our hides should be thick enough to withstand that temporary and momentary anger. I am not going to vote for any of these propositions. Everybody else had to sink or swim on the basis of the merits of their bill. Senator Duis, sitting here, was put through some heat the other day in trying to get his bill advanced and I'm sure he and a lot of others with controversial matters would like to have been able to wait if they would have known what was coming up to a date when we were just going to slide them through and look at all the agony and heartache and pain you could have been spared. I am not going to vote to suspend the deliberative process which should be connected with our legislative proceedings and that's all that I have to say and I hope I have made my position as various national politicians have said, perfectly clear.

PRESIDENT: Senator Reutzel.

SENATOR REUTZEL: Mr. President, members of the body, I can only echo what Senator Chambers said on this matter. I rise in opposition to this motion to take these bills up. Had we not had one particular resolution up for two days of debate, we would have got to all of these bills. I think, as Senator Chambers has said, these bills were here for a purpose of debating these bills and scrutinizing these bills, not having one person stand up for one minute, give one side of an issue and then, blimey, vote these bills across. I had the second priority bill up last year which we never heard because of lack of time so we made it through forty-three of them this year. I think it's a vast improvement. If I'd been one of the six maybe I'd been upset too that didn't get heard but I think we ought to reject this and get on with the business. We're wasting too much time here.

PRESIDENT: Senator Frank Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. President, I believe that these ought to have an opportunity but I concur with what Senator Reutzel and Senator Chambers have said. If we're going to have them I suggest that there ought to be a limited debate, Mr. Speaker, so at least those issues could be discussed. 442 is there. I want to just add these side remarks. Certainly I'd give Senator Chambers some water and I object to his use of my name by saying brutally frank so I want to be brutally earnest with you and tell you there ought to be some debate here.

PRESIDENT: I'm not suggesting you go to any desert, Senator Chambers. Senator Duis.