

has always been three rounds of debate, and if you go back in history there are a number of...numerous bills that the person who introduced the bill, or those that are opposing the bills, or people who simply have an interest find something that they can do to make the bill better or they all agree that they can make this change. And this is one of those that people on both sides agree that the change would be inappropriate as long as everyone agreed that the bill goes back to where it was. Final Reading is in fact third round debate. It's open for debate, it's open for amendment but it is more difficult to offer amendments because you also have to get the vote to bring it back, and then you lose a position on Final Reading, waits until the next time. But this is a very legitimate thing, it's done all the time. And if the body gets to the point where we say we only have two rounds of debate and if you don't get it done on General or Select File, because how many times on General File do we say, here's an amendment I'm thinking about, tell you what, let's talk about it, let's advance the bill and we'll work it on Select File. So a lot of times Select File is where it's at. And if we now say the argument is that Final Reading is not an appropriate place, we don't do a lot on General File because we bring up the issues, we work on them, on Select File, that implies, I guess, that we'll have one round of debate where we really get into the amendment process. And that's not the legislative forum, I mean that's not our rules, that's not the procedure and that's not the intent. This body has three rounds of debate. People on all sides of the issue have agreed on the amendment, they have agreed to bring the bill back and readvance the bill, and that's what I think the body should do. In regards to Senator Chambers' arguments, he's absolutely correct that we disagree on this issue. It will be his opinion versus those of others. My view of the constitution is that they set up a process and it's a state function, and the state function then is to determine how they wish their electors to behave, how they wish their electors to vote. We could not change the process necessarily, we could not go back and change the system that the...that was in the constitution. But it clearly, in my view, is a state function of a federal process. So consequently I do disagree with Senator Chambers, but there's always room for disagreement. But I do support the amendment. Third round debate is an appropriate time, particularly when all sides that have been combating the issue agree. I appreciate Senator Kristensen's, again, courtesy and being able to work on this particular issue.