

January 18, 1995

without it being clouded up with this extra wordage which perhaps may not be the wisest language. So that's the proposed amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Bromm. We have three lights on, two lights that were on before. Senator Elmer, did you wish to speak to Senator Bromm's amendment?

SENATOR ELMER: Yes.

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Senator Bromm, I appreciate your putting up the amendment after having been enlightened as to the possible skullduggery that many of our committees would be tempted engage in if this rule were in place and bow to the rhetoric that I've heard on the floor and the logic that that presents and do acquiesce and say, yes, that was probably a mistake to put in the proposed rule change, and I would support Senator Bromm's amendment to my amendment to the rules. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I haven't participated in the rule discussion much. I tend to believe that there is no way you can write a rule that will substitute for the lack of self-discipline if the body chooses to try and write a rule for everything, but more importantly, and I would be in support of the amendment by Senator Bromm, but I listened so frequently when you all have been discussing and you always bring up about the will of the majority and we tend to forget a very fundamental constitutional right that you have as an American. It's not the will of the majority, it is majority rule, but minority rights, and if there is anything in this system of the Unicameral that on occasion in terms of process that I feel we can perhaps have a shortcoming, is the lack of a really a good adversarial process from time to time. And certainly I have seen, and I've experienced where as an individual member you want to object because of a policy change that you do not like, then you become the adversarial discussion proponent of that objection. Indeed, you sometimes pay a price for it and that is a weakness which we don't willingly accept. So I strongly believe in preserving, even though it may take time, but I strongly believe in preserving the right of individual members to function. I would be opposed to the will