

controversial, just a bill that everybody could feel good about and deal with, and for once I'd like to have a bill like that. I saw LR 26 (sic) on the agenda and I thought I might finally get to a bill like that. But my good old friend, Senator DeCamp, wouldn't let me do it. I guess my prayers weren't answered, but I'd like to ask you all to help me out a little bit. LR 23 deals with the question of when we begin sessions. It doesn't deal with the question of when we have sessions. They are two very different issues. I support the Speaker's ruling that it is not germane to combine the two. The Lieutenant Governor was in the chair and ruled that it was not germane when this issue came up on Select File. In both cases it is very clear that the issues are very different because they are. I'm trying to change when we start the session, so that we can have a more orderly beginning to a 90 day session. That is a completely different intent than what we are trying to talk about here, going to one session every two years versus a session every year. That is, to me, a completely different issue. Now to emphasize the difference you have to understand there was a separate resolution to deal with the question of biennial sessions. If Senator DeCamp wanted to do that, to go to biennial sessions, he should have tried to overrule the killing of that resolution and had that resolution individually considered by this body. But he didn't choose to do that. He is choosing to amend this resolution. So if he was attempting to do what he is doing, in the legitimate fashion, it would have been done through that resolution, and he did not do that. Now there is another thing. If he wants to raise the issue on the floor, no issue can come up on the ballot until 1986, so there is nobody opposing him, reintroducing that resolution and trying next year again to bring it up, there is no reason that he has to do it this session. He can bring the resolution in separately next year. I also think you have to keep one other thing in mind. This is not a bill. The germaneness question is one that we are dealing with in a constitutional fashion. When you deal with an amendment to the Constitution I would urge you all to try and present to the voters as clear and distinct an issue as possible. We do not want to have the voters presented with two, or three, or a variable number of issues on the Constitution. That is too important a document to amend in such a manner. Legislation you can always come back the next year and change. But when you change that Constitution you change it pretty much forever. That is why I think, in this