

SENATOR WARNER: I'm tempted to call the question. (Laughter.) Maybe that was the message I was being sent. Mr. President, just briefly, I'm not going to talk a lot. I'm opposed to the amendment, I'm opposed to the bill, and I'm opposed to almost any amendment that might be offered to change the system that we now have. It's been said several times, I was here when we had a bill levy...a bill...not bill levy, I can tell when I got property tax on my mind. (Laughter.) I was here when we had the bill introduction limit, and I don't remember who all was here, but I know I had a drawer full of amendments, if some bill come along that would fit that's how you did it. You completely circumvented the public discussion and the public hearings, not intentionally, but you had no choice. And so I would very much...but more fundamental that...is that one of the purposes of a legislature is to permit an opportunity, through the introduction of a bill, that a citizens grievance can be addressed, it doesn't mean it has to be passed. At least two of you in this body today have shown me bills that they're introducing because of an individual, one citizen, who has a grievance. There may be others in a like situation, but you're aware of one. And that opportunity, as you put limitations on, simply will be lessened in citizens' opportunities that are lessened, not ours. I'm opposed to further limitations of days, the most popular thing you could do. And if you put on the ballot that the Legislature will meet less it's going to be popular, probably will pass. And then, as Senator Chambers indicated, all you're doing is trying to do more in less time. We look at other states, at least some of them that I've looked at, they have all kinds of processes where they are meeting before sessions, they will have process, many states have a very short time to meet. They have a process where a handful of legislators have the authority to make appropriations when the Legislature is not in session because of things that come up. We don't have any of those kinds of obstacles to open government. And I could appreciate that some may feel that some other time frame may be more convenient. You know, I don't know what a convenient time is, but I strongly do not believe that the public is benefitted. There is one thing I would support and that would be to go back to biannual sessions but without a limit on days. And that's where everybody leads me. But that's what we used to have, and I don't see anything wrong with that. As a matter of fact, we didn't meet, even the longest one wasn't a whole lot more days than we meet now in a two-year period, and