

January 14, 1991

differently, for example, than the Appropriations Committee does, and we want to have a priority on that, which would then make sense. So, my amendment simply says, if the committee has not met, has decided not to meet with the agency that they want to make an amendment on at that point, that they can make such an amendment. The amendment will simply have no priority as to any...any more priority than any other amendment at that time.

SPEAKER BAACK: Is there discussion of this amendment? Senator Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. President, members, I guess I would have to remain standing to oppose this recommended change in the rules. We did...our committee did talk, at some length, about how this should be established and why. One of the problems we have with the proposed Bernard-Stevens amendment is the identifying of what particular, what particular agency would be with what particular Standing Committee. One of the reasons some of us who thought it was probably a good idea to have all of the agencies of the state mandated to come before a Standing Committee has also agreed that somebody, the Executive Board, or Speaker, or somebody, would have to identify which of those agencies should be involved with which Standing Committees. The possibility exists that there would be some Standing Committees that would have no identification with an agency of the state that they were most interested in. It could also mean that there would be some committees that have an overabundance of agencies to deal with, and an overabundance of the percentage of the market, so to speak, the budget itself, to be discussed. We just thought it complicated it to put any more language in such as that, and that what we were trying to establish here is a responsibility on the part of the Standing Committees. At the same time we presume that Standing Committee, which I'm sure operates, in most cases, with a majority of will in that committee, would, in fact, handle this responsibility appropriately, and we didn't have to spell out for them that they have to go through certain hoops to recommend to the body this amendment on an appropriation, or any other amendment that they would want. So, I just think it would com...the language that he recommends would complicate the rule change and, I think, emasculate, in some ways, the responsibilities of the Standing Committees and, in fact, in some ways maybe even discourage their willingness to get involved and participate. There may be reasons out there, I'm not sure of or know of, that would demand this, in a sense simple rule change, and I would