

January 11, 1996

Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, what Senator Maurstad has attempted to do thus far by his amendments is make this rule, this proposed change, a bit more rational and palatable and suitable for a legislative process of the kind that exists in a Unicameral Legislature. Before I go on, I want to make it clear that I'm in support of Senator Maurstad's motion to amend. Sometimes when I begin to talk I don't focus on exactly what it is that's before us. But my understanding, Senator Maurstad, if I may ask you this before I proceed, is that there would have to be a designation of these bills or a bill, whatever it turned out that that would be designated by the Speaker as a major proposal, that would have to...that bill or those bills would have had to be designated by a senator as a priority bill.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Senator, that's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And I'm in support of that, even though I don't like the rule, because if that is not done we have a situation where with all this talk by Senator Warner, who's called the Dean of the Legislature; Senator Beutler, who is called the one who analyzes bills and finds all the flaws in them; Senator Will, who is Chairperson of the Rules Committee; that organization is so important, focus is so important, but if you're going to allow, by adoption of this rule change that's being proposed, not Senator Maurstad's amendment to it, an expansion of this whole concept of special bills that can be placed above the bills of every senator in here. As the proposed rule change reads now, there is no criteria whatsoever for designating or designating how a major proposal is to be decided upon. All that the Speaker has to do is say, this is a major proposal, and it is, as simple as that. Senator Maurstad is bringing it within the existing structure of priority bills. It's so difficult, Senator Maurstad, for me to linger on what is actually before us because I have other things I want to say, but I can't think of anything else that I need to say to show why I support your amendment. I'm going to support it. But I have to go again to the general thrust of this proposed rule change. And again, I'm speaking for the record. This is a one-house Legislature composed, supposedly, of citizen