

manner, but needs to be backed up. And we have mathematical models to identify what constitutes significance. But in this body we talk about significance, and staggering, and grave, terms of that nature that we throw around trying to prove our point, which they are probably proper terms for debate, and they'll get into the intent language that way. But to lead in an act or a bill with this kind of language, I think, is inappropriate, and I certainly support this discussion and commend Senator Withem for bringing it to our attention. I don't think in many cases it's the senators that are even doing it, it's staff that maybe that are helping us write that legislation. In many cases we immediately jump down to the guts of the bill, and jump over all these findings when, in fact, those findings are something that we don't think is very important, and maybe they're not. But I think Senator Withem also raises a very good point in that ten years from now we look back, and someone could read through our statutes and wonder what kind of society we have, because we just have all of these grave concerns that we're trying to fix everywhere, when in fact many of them may have been adjusted. I think if we'd go back and look at certain bills that were passed, 775 probably has a page or two of findings of all the things that we have to do to stabilize our economy. And if we look at it now, we would probably laugh at some of the findings that we were trying to address under 775, because 775 either did do those things, or we recognized that bill did not help in that regard, whatever those findings were. So, I...I...I certainly support Senator Withem's point and how he wants to deal with it relative...this bill. And it's maybe a shame that we're dealing with it on this bill, but it certainly needs to be talked about.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Conway. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I hadn't particularly intended to talk about it either, but we're getting a little philosophical, and that motivated me to comment. The...I was trying to think back. I can recall, first time I can recall, and it probably has been around a long time, but I recall in the sixties when the concept of intent language began to show up. And I know when that was initially done, it was to...basically, it was to give direction to an agency as to what was expected or intended of an agency by proposed legislation in a verbal type of...of explanation rather than necessarily the more legal language that a bill may...may have. And it was done, in part, to...as an alternative to what used to