

amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: The Beutler amendment is adopted. Does anyone else wish to speak to the main motion? Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Madam President, members of the body, I knew I had this article, and I just laid my hands on it. It's in the State Legislatures magazine, July 1990, the headlines, "Idaho Court Says Legislature May Veto Administrative Rules". In a landmark decision, the Idaho Supreme Court upheld, 3 to 2, the Legislature's right to veto administrative rules by concurrent resolution. Since the late 1970s, numerous federal and state court decisions have denied Legislatures the authority to veto such rules. Breaking with precedence in establishing other jurisdictions, the Idaho court said it is valid for the Legislature to reject an administrative rule that does not reflect the legislative intent contained in enabling statutes. The decision was based on the premise that Idaho's Administrative Procedures Act and the section of the Idaho code authorizing legislative vetoes were passed in a constitutional manner, thus the legislative veto may negate what an executive or independent agency has proposed. So, I think this is a landmark decision, and this is exactly what we're doing this morning with LB 22. We're saying we are going to look at rules and regulations, and we're going to make a decision as to whether it follows our intent or not. And possibly we should consider, in the future, adopting what this Supreme Court decision says to give us more authority to look at administrative rules and regulations. So, I did want to bring to the attention of the body, the members of this body, that we do, legally, have this right to change those. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Haberman. I'll now recognize Senator Landis followed by Senator Beutler. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: I'll waive at this point, I'll keep my light on.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: George, if I may, there's one part that I think we discussed a little bit earlier, but I want to be absolutely clear as to legislative intent. You had an amendment