

remarks I'll be making here. Number one is just a comment. It's kind of nice when the most divisive issue before the Legislature, on the fifty-ninth day, is whether we'll adjourn before or after we do veto overrides. And I will attempt to resolve that point right now and suggest that after visiting with the chief sponsor of the budget bill, I guess the person who introduced it, that was me, and the four people who have amendments to the bill, there appears to be a consensus that we'd all rather wait until tomorrow to do veto overrides. So I'm going to be making a motion to adjourn after we decide what we're going to do with LR 15CA. Secondly, the concept of a summary was one that way back on the tenth or twelfth day, this session, when we first considered this LR, I had offered it to the body, the body at that time thought it was a good idea. Again, it might be another good reason why we consider measures more than once in here. And on reflection, I'm going to support the Chambers amendment. I think the idea of the summary had some appeal because there would actually be something being read to the body that might be...that I thought may be more reflective than what is in the bill. On reflection, it might open up the possibility of some game playing. I will be voting for the Chambers amendment, which in effect strips the amendment I had added to this on General File. Third, the procedure as it relates to LR 15CA...I understand what Senator Coordsen had to say, that it would be a dangerous precedent to come in on the fifty-ninth and sixtieth day of short session and willy-nilly introduce resolutions amending the constitution. We haven't done that with this case. This LR, up to this point, has in fact had a...has been treated as a bill. It was...there was a public hearing, it was advanced, it was debated on General File, it's been on the agenda countless days for Select File, it just never got up. I have no problems with the procedure of suspending our rule, provided up until this time it has been treated as a bill. We've done that any number of occasions over the years. As a matter of fact, it's my understanding that the concept of LR-CA's being treated as bills is a relatively, in the full history of the Unicameral, is a relatively new addition. I see no problem with the procedure. And, number four, I think what Senator Kristensen has here is a procedure that will not abolish Final Reading, will allow the concept of Final Reading to remain in place, but will be used in situations where it may...we may have a better use of our legislative time. I trust that succeeding Rules Committees of the Legislature, in succeeding Legislatures will be able to properly implement this rule. And I point out that we would be able to, with our rules,