

wouldn't have to deal with it last session. One of the big selling points of that proposal to bring it to the floor was, look, it's not a priority bill, we're busy with other matters, we won't have to discuss it this session, we'll put it off until next session. A lot of people voted for it, I think, to bring it out of committee for that reason, feeling that they wouldn't have to deal with it at that time. Now we are at the time when we have to deal with it. Now we are at a time when we have to see that bill, look at all of its imperfections and try to hassle with the language, something that should have been done in committee last year. Far from being a motion to penalize people from being reasonable, I think it is a motion that eliminates the entire body from being penalized by a bill that is very poorly drafted and very poorly worded. I think that if, in fact, the senators who are quibbling about the language can meet for the next two weeks, present one amendment that will satisfy everyone, eliminate as much as possible the vague and ambiguous language in that bill, that will clarify some of the provisions, that it should be done all in one piece. It seems to me that the sides could then meet, draft one amendment satisfactory to everybody, bring it onto the floor, we could discuss it in 15 minutes and pass it and not have to spend the next hour or two trying to do it here on the floor of the Legislature. I think the real issue that we need to address is once we get the language worked out, and I don't think...frankly do not think the bill can be helped by the language because I think the entire basic underlying philosophy and concept of the bill is flawed, then I think this Legislature cannot worry about all the trivial concerns of the language and get to the very heart of the issue and discuss the entire concept of the bill and decide whether we want to vote it up or down. We had a motion to indefinitely postpone last week. That motion failed by one vote. Had that motion passed, we would not be here today dealing with four or five or six amendments. And I think it is entirely appropriate that the parties meet, March 1 seems to be a good time. If those compromises can be reached, and it seems that they can, then they can bring it out as one amendment, put that amendment in, then we can debate the bill. There will be plenty of time for the parties to pass that bill at that time. We don't need to spend all the time here on the floor today. I would like to get to the real heart of the issue, and that is the entire concept and philosophy of the bill, which I cannot agree with. And then we could debate that issue, because that is really the important issue in this matter. And certainly the language is...shouldn't go uncorrected. If, in fact, by some