

session when we're all under the gun and that there is some pressure to do other things. One of the other, I think, counter arguments that needs to be examined is well if we speed up the process, things...you know, that's not always good. That may allow us to pass more legislation, or we may get in a hurry, to the effect that we are not eliminating any stage of debate. If we were eliminating a stage, I think that's extremely true. If we were allowing a rule to be made where there was only an hour of debate, or that we cut down meaningful debate, I think that argument has some legitimacy that we are, indeed, speeding up the process to the point of being dangerous with it. The final thing that I would like to stress upon the Legislature and, of course, to those people who are watching our proceedings and those who are going to ultimately get a chance to examine this, is this is not an outright appeal of Final Reading. That's been tried in the state. The voters are uncomfortable about doing that in the past. We've tried the opportunity of saying we'd just do away with it. What this proposal does is say there shall be Final Reading, that's going to be in the constitution, unless there's a vote of three-fifth of all the members elected to the Legislature who vote not to read it. And I think that would be done on each bill. That would not be something I would envision being done at the beginning of a session when we make a blanket vote and say, well, for all bills this session we're not going to read them. I envision this to be done on a piecemeal basis. And I think that it will probably be used only for cases where there are extremely long bills that will take a lot of time, or if there was some other reason to do that. What are those facts and circumstances, you know, who knows? But it's the flexibility that we're asking the voters to approve and not an outright repeal of Final Reading. And if you've had students, guests, whatever that come down particularly in the spring, and who fill our balconies or watch our proceedings, and they've traveled six to eight hours to come down, and all they hear is our Clerk mumbling through, and you go back and we begin to explain to them, look, the constitution requires us to do so, it's not particularly beneficial. It is a tradition, that's true. Is there a better use and need for some flexibility? Absolutely. At this point I'm not sure that with our technical staff that we run this great a risk of making mistakes. We have professional bill drafters, people who review bills for proofreading them. Obviously senators have the opportunity, with the bills printed, as close to, or at least giving us as much time as possible to review those before you make the final votes. We lessen the chances for mistakes. Do we eliminate the