

January 8, 1996

form of the bill that is actually to be voted on?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator, all I could do is speculate and I believe that that is the reason for the one-day requirement in the constitution and I would then assume that that is the reason why whoever authored this provision in our rules, whenever it was authored, would have done. I mean that's the logical rationale for having a rule such as this, but I don't know that for a fact to be the reason.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And my feeling is the same as yours, but I don't know it either. I just wanted to indicate that it, it's a reasonable reason for the existence of the two-day requirement. On this one, I'm not going to support striking the two and changing it to one. I routinely vote, in most instances, to suspend the rule and allow those bills that have been on Final Reading for at least one day, one legislative day, to be voted on by virtue of our suspending the rule. But that doesn't mean every time that a bill is in that situation would I vote to do it. I would rather that an affirmative vote be taken knowingly, deliberately, by the Legislature, to suspend this rule and vote on final passage after only one day instead of changing the rule to only one day. So I'm in opposition to this particular change.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam Speaker, members of the Legislature, I just wanted to speak briefly in favor of the change. This is not one of the big ones that requires a lot of debate, I suppose. Reasonable people can certainly disagree on this one, too. I guess in committee I was persuaded to favor the change because of two thoughts. One, the constitution requires one day. The constitution is what the people said they thought was necessary. And so I felt comfortable following the same direction that the people gave us in requiring only one day. In addition to that, it seemed to me that the way to look at it was this way, we suspend this rule a number of times every session. And it's, it seems to me to make more sense to do what we almost always do. And if somebody like Senator Chambers wants to make the motion to suspend the rule and have a second day layover in a particular case, then they ought to have the right to do that and we ought to listen to them and if it makes sense extend it to a second day. However, since the overwhelming majority of