

the body is not willing to, I guess, deal from a position of strength. They would prefer to be tugged and pulled like a piece of taffy, and that is exactly what will happen when we come back January 1. That probably would happen under any scenario, so that's a bit of a lukewarm analogy, I guess, but it is clearly one where we will not have the same under the Warner amendment or under Senator Lamb's amendment, which was defeated, would not have the same position of strength that I, frankly, think we need. It is, as you can see as the afternoon wears on and the day wears on, a very difficult subject matter, and I know there are other things going on this afternoon in terms of committee hearings, and I understand that, but this is a very important issue that needs to be addressed, hopefully, will be addressed for the next day or two as amendments continue to pile on. But be that as it may, I will I think support Senator Warner's attempt at this point to, basically, bring us back to where we are January 1 of 1992. I am not so sure that, frankly, it is all that different from the proposal as it is spelled out in the bill, but I will...I will live with that because I think the body's inclination is to support this amendment, and I prefer to get back on the winning side of an amendment for awhile.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Schmit. Senator Kristensen, did you wish to address this amendment by Senator Warner and Conway? Senator Hall, your name is up again. Senator Moore, did you wish to address this amendment?

SENATOR MOORE: No.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Hefner.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President and members, I have a question of Senator Warner.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Warner, would you respond, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Yes, sir.

SENATOR HEFNER: Senator Warner, I didn't quite understand, do we have a copy of your amendment on our desk?

SENATOR WARNER: No.

SENATOR HEFNER: Is there a copy printed in the Journal?