

discussion about why that happened or finger-pointing or any of that type of process because it adds nothing to our process at this point. I do want to comment on how I'm recommending that we deal with those issues because they did pass the Legislature last year and all of them were the subject of fairly lengthy debate and most members of the body, with the exception of the new six, had an opportunity at that time to get their input. My suggestion is we treat them slightly differently than we do other resolutions and for that reason I have asked the committee chairs with the jurisdiction over these matters to give them early hearings to expedite their treatment. I've indicated to the sponsors of those that we would be special ordering those early in the session as soon as they became available. I am not suggesting though that we take the next step which might be to suspend the rules to allow these to be voted on only once. They are, after all, amendments to the constitution and they need to have as much debate as the body feels is necessary. Nor am I suggesting that any member of the body that feels strongly about any of these bills not engage fully in the debate over these measures. Again, they are matters that I know some people have strong feelings about pro and con and those pros and cons ought to be expressed. But they are being put on the agenda early on in the session. The other two, when and if their committees complete deliberation on those, I believe, Senator Schellpeper, you had a hearing yesterday on the horse racing amendment and I believe the Revenue Committee also had a hearing last week on the Board of Equalization measure that Senator Kristensen brought to us. Those matters will be brought to the front of the agenda early on for special ordering and that's the rationale for doing that. In terms of LR 4CA, I believe this would be a tool that we should give ourselves as a Legislature to more expeditiously deal with the business that we deal with. It is a compromise measure from earlier versions. Earlier versions simply did propose to do away with Final Reading. This one provides that there will be Final Reading unless 30 members of the Legislature vote to dispense with it, with Final Reading. How exactly that would be dealt with would be up to the Rules Committee in future legislative sessions. What about the arguments that people have had an opportunity to vote on this in the past and have chosen to retain it? It's been a number of years since they have had an opportunity to vote on it. I think a number of things have changed since then because of statewide cable television coverage. I think more and more people know what Final Reading involves. I remember when I, the last time this was on the ballot, I was still a teacher and a number of