

March 30, 1976

suggestion that they be held until the last day. It would just hasten our time for tomorrow's schedule if we were to take them up today and hold them, and not deliver them to the Governor until we have the others. I do know that the vote will be taken earlier than the other bills, but would you oppose or would this body oppose the idea of taking them up for Final Reading today?

SENATOR DUIS: Senator Burbach, I certainly wouldn't oppose it. The only thing that I ask, and that is that if Senator Carsten would give us his report prior to the reading of these bills, where we are with our estimated income. I think that he is back today, and if he could do this I think that it would clear the air so that the members of the Legislature would have an idea as to how much money we would be spending relative to the amount of money that we have for projected income but give them better idea as to how to establish their priorities. I would absolutely have no objection to this. I think, Senator Burbach, that you should make a motion to that affect in order to nullify the other motion and just merely make a motion that these bills be read on Final Reading and held in the possession of the Legislature until after all of those bill had been read. Prior to that, reading of the bills, ask that Senator Carsten make his report to us if he might as to our projected income, versus the bills that were passed.

SENATOR BURBACH: We will do this, and we will have some time for Senator Carsten to have that ready and for the other motion.

PRESIDENT: We will commence with 987 Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment offered is offered by Senator DeCamp which is a series of amendments, is Senator DeCamp here?

PRESIDENT: Is Senator DeCamp in the Chamber?

CLERK: All right the next one after that is offered by Senator Chambers, (read Chambers amendment).

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, there was an attempt yesterday which was justifiably turned down to place this commission in the office of the Secretary of State. The arguments were that it should not be under the control of an individual who was elected on a partisan basis to a public office. It is the responsibility of this Commission to make rulings with reference to elections. So, the same argument can be utilized in support of the amendment that I am offering. Suppose the Governor and the Secretary of State would be part of an election which would be questioned, or their activities would be questioned. As elected public officials they still sit on the Commission that is going to make judgments. I think that it is totally improper. The other day I tried to offer an amendment to take them off the Commission entirely, but for whatever reasons, and Senators are very quick to say that the Legislature in its wisdom, I say the legislature and its "unwisdom" wanted to leave two elected partisan officials on the Commission. If they must