

January 10, 1996

you're truly interested in moving towards a defined program that protects the little guy and protects against the Speaker you will be in favor of this amendment. You will be in favor of this amendment, not against it. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Warner on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, my comments are going to be exceedingly brief 'cause I don't get in a lot of rules too much. They...just a couple thoughts that run through my mind. I don't have any problem supporting the rule, plan to do so. Seems to me rules in this body have essentially two general purposes. One is to hopefully attempt to facilitate discussion of an issue that's before us in the form of a bill or whatever form. And the second thing is the rules, as long as I've been here, have been designed to not preclude those who were opposed to legislation or a majority wanted to push (inaudible) they had a fair and adequate opportunity express their opposition, and that is not such an unusual rule 'cause that does nothing but reflect our constitution, both federally and state. The constitution is, we always talk about majority rule, but the important part of a constitution is minority rights, not majority rule. And so to the extent that your rules can do...provide ample opportunity for those who disagree with the position that the body's going, that they have ample opportunity to get their position across, then I think that's as far as those rules can go and ought to go. But I want to say one other thing and the only reason I stood up, this issue never came up until we went on limitation of sessions and I know that's popular with the public. The less we're here the less number of problems, is the usual assumption. Ever since we put limitation then we have gradually found ourselves in the position where you had to be...some methodology, and it has been outlined before that a variety of things have been tried, where those things that most...in somebody's or some groups of judgment ought to be addressed, that were most important to be addressed, some way they got there. Otherwise, you leave it to chance and that's, you know, I can live with that too. I've been quoted many times saying if we got along with something...without something for 125 years, why, 126 maybe didn't make that much difference. But I'm going to support the rule change because as long as we've got the limitation on days you're going to need some methodology in which things that need