

a better job in one session and it makes people, it makes it easier for people to serve is one that I find most difficult to accept. Frankly, the legislature is a very time consuming job. And if we did not take the second year for our deliberations but instead only extended the first year to be nearly a year long session. I think that would preclude many more who are serving now from serving. It would preclude them from serving because they would be totally unable during that period to earn a living. It would make it more difficult for the agricultural senators that serve in this body because those individuals would find themselves having to hire the work done in the spring. I think that as the spring moved to summer they would be hiring people to do some of the additional work. Some of those who irrigate like Senator Kahle will be finding that he will be having to rely on his sons and if Senator Kahle's sons should decide to run and they are more active in the agricultural interest, family interests today than he is, then they would be precluded. It would preclude lawyers from running. It would preclude myself from being able to serve because I can not afford to take the time presently at the compensation level that presently exists and would be less able to do that even though the next year I would be totally able to do some work, I would not be able to put all that kind of time in it. Frankly, it has some other problems in terms of dealing with the state's business. Yes, it is true that we have a lot of bills on general file that will not be heard this year. That is probably as it should be. But, to guarantee that those bills will be heard does not guarantee that each and everyone of those bills should be heard or deserve that great consideration. In fact, what we do now is probably the right thing for the state, it is fact that we deal with the most important bills and those less important stay there without consideration. I think that this whole proposal has been discussed before and frankly, we changed it. The people of the state changed it. They changed it because it served this state better to have annual considerations of the budget. I think that frankly the Warner amendment is a return to the past not all that beautiful of a past at that. One last consideration that I would offer, that is the question of the great stress and strain of many of the legislators who are able to serve. As we know when we look around there are diversity of legislators in this body. Some of them are older and stress and strain and the hazards of this job would wear most heavily on those members and if it was a nine month job, as we was during the. . .

PRESIDENT: One minute Senator Newell.