

did not sense on any of the amendments offered that any of the amendments were dilatory, any of the amendments were offered in bad faith, any of the amendments were delaying amendments. In fact, even at the end when in the beginning the first concept was to oppose the Janssen amendment, even Senator Bohlke came around when she realized there were votes for the Janssen amendment and graciously decided, well, maybe she'd go along with that. And I think that's good. But there were about 19 other amendments, and most of those were substantive amendments. And I just want to point out to the body that what we've done by her...and I know we use the phrase hurrying and sometimes it's in jest, and sometimes it's not. But when you talk about hurrying on a one-house Legislature, by saying that we don't want to talk anymore about the issue, let's move it one more step, what we've done is on those substantive amendments that are about 19 in nature, now we're going to come down to one round debate on those issues. And I really, if we wanted to get to the amendment, Senator Bohlke, if you wanted to get to the waivers, we could have gotten to them on General File. We didn't have to waste all the time on trying to cease debate when the body didn't want to do so. If we want to get to the amendments, then let's take the time, let's go into the evenings like we did on Micron. I think welfare reform is an important enough issue, let's take the time and address the issue. And we may not be able to have our dinner, we may not be able to go with our group, but we can take the time at least to talk about the issue. And I echo what Senator Chambers says, though he and I may differ when we get to a final vote on the bill, I hope that we take all of the amendments that are substantive in nature and are well-meaning in nature and we take every one of them on Select File because this body said we don't want to have any first round debate on the important issues of the waivers and the other areas, we want to limit it just to one more round of debate, because we all know Final Reading is not a time where you make a lot of changes. I am concerned that so many of our new members are so willing to do this without questioning whether or not a one-house body that is a proper thing to do. And I'm also concerned that when we do want to finally hurry and get things along, because we don't want to stay because we have other arrangements socially that we may want to do. I think if we're really serious that the body has to roll up its sleeves. If there are 19 amendments we should have been willing to stay later into the evening, start earlier in the morning, go later into the evening. But the issue deserved all of the amendments talked about on first round debate that were meaningful. And I