

January 10, 1996

pending to that proposal.

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Will, would you like to bring us up?

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. Proposed rule change number 6 is the final rules change that has been proposed and recommended by the Rules Committee. And as I'm sure you recall from yesterday, this is the rule that would give the Speaker some additional powers with respect to bills that are designated as major proposals. Just in a nutshell, what this rule change would propose is that the Speaker would be authorized to designate up to ten bills as major proposals with the concurrence of the Executive Board of the Legislature. The Speaker would have to do that within the first 20 days of the legislative session so whoever the Speaker is would have 10 days beyond bill introduction to do so. The ramifications of having a bill designated as a major proposal would be that the Speaker would then have certain powers with respect to determining a date certain by which the committee to which the bill is referred would have to hold a hearing and subsequently determining a date by which the committee would have to take some action, even if that action were only a vote that resulted in no recommendation one way or the other. Finally and perhaps most importantly to the way that we operate in the Legislature, the Speaker would then also be authorized to set certain parameters for debate, the most important of which for purposes of the way we operate would be determining the order in which amendments are taken up on a major proposal. And I think this, as I explained yesterday, reflects I think some of the concerns that have been expressed to me and to other members of the Rules Committee by members of the Legislature with respect to the way that we deal with issues that are deemed I think in most people's minds to be major and worthy of discussion on the floor of the Legislature. The way the proposal was drafted would allow the Speaker to designate up to ten bills or resolutions as major proposals. Senator Maurstad's amendment would change that ten to five. Frankly, I don't have a problem with that. I think we threw out the number ten literally arbitrarily. That's something that we just said let's toss it out there and see what the members of the body think. If you would not like to go...if you do like this rules change but perhaps would like to see it limited to a smaller number of proposals, the Maurstad amendment certainly would be appropriate. I don't have any objection to it. In fact, I think it probably is more reasonable to embark