

January 11, 1996

rule as written should be able to kick in. At that point if the proposal is deemed to be major and the...by the Speaker and the Executive Board agrees, then the Speaker should have that latitude to be able to go to the committee chairmen and do...and arrive with some certainty as to a date for a hearing and subsequent action by the committee. Obviously with the change that we just approved, that Senator Maurstad proposed and that I agreed with, which requires a major proposal to previously have been designated a priority bill by a senator. This provision, as Senator Chambers points out, would not always kick in, but there would be times, as Senator Withem pointed out, that it would. And I think that that is entirely appropriate and within the spirit of the rule as offered. So I would think we would want to keep the provisions in the rule that refer to the Speaker and the committee chair arriving at a date certain for hearings and for action by the committee. Thank you.

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

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, this amendment before you right now is a perfect example of what's wrong with our process. Do you know what this amendment does? Does anybody know at this point? You don't, you can't possibly unless you went up to the Clerk and read it, because nobody has talked about it. But this particular amendment says that in order for the Speaker to designate now, instead of having...just have the approval of the Executive Board, he has to have the approval of every member of the Executive Board. I hope that strikes every member in here as totally impractical and, in fact, in its nature dilatory. In any event, we've proceeded now to have a couple of speeches and none of the speeches have been about this amendment. They have all been about the consequences of the Maurstad amendment, and there may be another amendment on that, and at that time we can discuss that. I think that the logic that Senator Chambers has expressed on that is not logic but is, rather, illogical, and he's attached the words "in cahoots" to suggest that there's a greater possibility of people being in cahoots now under the amendment as drafted with the Maurstad amendment, which is not true at all. It's not true at all, in my opinion. In any event, I wanted to relay to you the nature of the present amendment which requires the approval of every member of the Executive Board in order to do this, which I hope you will find, along with me, is not a reasonable request.