

January 11, 1996

with the committee chair to come up with an agreement of when that proposal would have a hearing and certainly would be able to place that important issue, whatever it might be, those five issues on the agenda at whatever level that the Speaker would like to do, or whatever portion the Speaker would like to do. The real controversy I think is how much power do you give the Speaker in regards to amendments, and I'm not going to speak... I'll speak this time unless somebody asks me a question, but otherwise I'll close on it and speak then, but I remember back at the crime debate we had last year and, if members of the Legislature remember, Senator Lindsay, whether it be right or wrong, had a process of which he wanted to get a bill before the Legislature, pass it, and get by a filibuster and so they had a cloture motion, if you remember, but they also decided which amendments that they were going to allow, which amendments would be at the top and which ones would then would fall after the cloture motion and so that would be it. And the body did not like that at all because many senators, and I think Senator Witek may have been one of those, I'm not sure if my memory serves me correctly, but had amendments that they wished to have presented to the Legislature and it simply wasn't going to happen that way. And the Legislature agonized over that and we talked about a due process of senators' rights of having amendments that they have filed, at least discussed. And I think that process is the one that concerns me the most about the change. I don't mind the Speaker necessarily having five bills that they can pick, he or she could pick in the future. I don't mind that they work with committee chairs and with agreements, now with the Maurstad amendment, would be able to find a hearing date because the committee can still kill the bill, can do whatever with the bill they like. I do have a problem with the Speaker being able to designate which senator's amendments would all of a sudden be important and which senator's amendments would not be important. That bothers me. And I've always kidded my colleagues, but I say it tongue in cheek, some people might take it seriously, think if I were Speaker and I had that power how comfortable you'd feel with that, and I assume that once I say that this motion will pass without any objection at some point. But I... my sense is if we can get rid of this section, we might be able to move on to get the rules adopted today and move onward. That's the nature of the amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator