

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Warner, there are other lights on. Did you want to leave your motion up until they...

SENATOR WARNER: Yes, I'll leave it a little bit.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Lindsay, followed by Senator Hall.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I don't want to prolong this either. The bill is...when I looked at it, as far as question of whether to run it or not, it's a fourteen line bill, it shouldn't take us any time and I don't want it to extend the debate any further, but I did want to get a vote on the policy. We voted in terms of a budget bill that's the...we voted on the policy and advanced it in the past at Select File, but at this point, or at the override level, we were voting because there was a question of do we have the dollars right now to do that? I assumed the bill would be vetoed by the Governor if it's passed, but I guess what I'm looking at is getting some sense of the body, we seem to send a lot of messages about this time of year, but at least send a message of hope for those people who were out there behind the glass a little bit earlier that maybe this body is going to take a look at paying them a little bit above the poverty level in the future, give them some hope for that and whether there is some sense from within this body that we do intend to address this problem, and just the bottom line, whether it's good policy, whether the people in government who have the same duties, same responsibilities should be paid at such a wide...15, roughly 15 percent disparity in pay. With that I would, like I say, I'm not going to take any further time and I would just urge that we vote yes on the bill.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Warner, yours is the last light on. Would you like to close?

SENATOR WARNER: I'm going to withdraw, Mr. President, because that will be the quickest way, but I offered the motion and it has absolutely nothing to do with the issue that you resolved, but I believe that it creates more problems if you enact it than if you don't. If you wish to interpret it as the signal to people that you're going to look at it next year, that's fine and good, but if it becomes a precedent in which next year we have five bills introduced for other areas, in time you will have destroyed the job classification system and that's the kind