

January 12, 1981

it down, but the Rules Committee proceeded to approve it, so now it has been approved by the LR 168 Committee which was the leadership of the Legislature and also by the Rules Committee. Then it went before the Legislature January 1 of last year. At that point in time there were a number of rule changes and people sat down and said, look, we can't spend all day arguing rules, we have to compromise some of these things down a way and settle some of these things, which made a lot of sense. So that original rule became from two weeks each session to one week of the long session, essentially about a fourth of the time that the original study committee had recommended. One of the main arguments seems to be that we are being lazy, that we can get this all done much faster and that we don't really need this recess. Well, from the public's point of view I hope I have satisfied you that there is an argument that we do need the recess. From our own personal point of view though let me point out this to you. The Speaker has come up with three alternative schedules. Now two of those schedules, one of them plans on ending the session on June 4th, and the other two anticipate a June 1st ending of the session. Two schedules, both ending June 1st. Under one there is an Easter break. Under the other there is no Easter break but there is the one week recess under the bill introduction period. So what I am telling you is quite clear is this. If you want to end by June 1st, if that is the goal...

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Beutler, you have one minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...you can do it. You do it by simply asking the Speaker not to have an Easter recess and instead have the one week recess after the bill introduction period, and I suggest to you that this is what should be done because in that manner we can satisfy our personal goals of getting home by June 1st, if that is what we are after, as best I can discern that is what we are after, and at the same time we can satisfy the public by giving them the week recess that they think they need to look over the bills and see what is going on. There is one thing I just wanted to emphasize in closing and that is this was not a last minute thing decided upon at the end of the session last year. This rule went into effect, in fact, on January 1 of last year. It was debated thoroughly at that time. I guess what I find a little disturbing about the process this morning, and I hope you can see what is going on, all of a sudden we have discovered a new process by which we can argue a rule a second time. This rule has been argued. It was argued thoroughly the 1st of January...