

doubt in my mind that the voters would approve such a proposal. One of the things that would be argumentative it would take the time limit off, but every year when we get to this stage of consideration with the time limits it seems to me that it becomes more and more obvious that it is not prudent to do the kind of crunch that we get into trying to complete our work. Secondly, biennial sessions changes in law would not be made as frequently, would give some stability for at least some period of time as to the various state policies and finally I frankly believe that biennial sessions of course means biennial budgets, you would find a much more prudent use of the tax payers funds, if that was the case. Obviously if emergencies come up, special sessions can be held, but we even have those with annual sessions. So, that is almost immaterial. But, I think if anything, most of us recognize that almost every session there is a high percentage or a large percentage at least of the bills that are considered merely a few months before and not an act that certainly many of the bills that are carried over are bills which couldn't make it through the first time and probably shouldn't have the second time. Finally, I have not been particularly impressed with the benefit of interim studies in the short period of time we now have them make them. Back when there is biennial sessions and granted there are exceptions when I say this, but back when we had biennial sessions almost all interim studies went into depth and a lot more time was spent in really searching them out rather than introduce resolution, hold a hearing sometimes between sessions and come out with legislation. So I think the public would be better served. I think it would be easier for the members of the Legislature to serve and I think it would be an appropriate amendment that the voters would eagerly endorse. I move the bill be returned to the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, members of the body, I rise to oppose the Warner amendment. I rise to oppose the Warner amendment for a couple of very simple reasons. You know this issue was debated on this floor on the question of moving from the annual sessions biennial sessions and that question was debated long and hard. But, as I recall, the situation that proceeded the change that the people authorized was an excessively long session that lasted well into September with the same number of bills that is presently heard over the two year period, being introduced in that one session. Now from a number of different standpoints I'm not sure that it serves the people well. The argument that frankly we do