

January 11, 1996

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

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, just a quick remark. I objected to the substitution of the amendment. It wasn't because I didn't want Senator Chambers to get up his particular amendment. I happen to think it's a little more worthy an amendment suggestion than three others that he has up there, the others that he has up there. I did it just to illustrate a point, that you may have an amendment that you think is better than something else, but if somebody objects to the substitution of the amendment you're still stuck with the old order. I just wanted to...I just thought it was an opportunity to point out one of what...the very problem...a part of, a portion of the very problem that we're talking about. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I hope it's clear to the members that I didn't try to make that substitution because I'm running out of things to say on the amendments that I have pending. I think each one of those amendments offered does go to a policy question, and each one is worthy of debate and discussion. But in the same way that Senator Beutler wanted my amendments to be discussed, to show you what can happen later in the session, I want you to listen to what Senator Beutler said and what Senator Bromm said earlier, to show why I indicate that there is an overweening arrogance on the part of those who support the proposal that's before us now. They are the ones who are so superior to the rest of us that they determine that something offered by a member is dilatory, they determine that it has no merit, they determine that it has no worth. That is what I object to. Others on the floor may feel that once they propose something to the Legislature and opposition develops, they should swallow spit, tuck tail and run, because they don't want to offend anybody or become...because they become immediately doubtful of their own good judgment. That kind of standard does not apply to me. When I offer things, I have thought them through. Some of them are lighthearted, some are trifling, some are intentionally designed to call attention to an issue by taking an approach that is not really practical in terms of being adopted, such as my Lola amendment yesterday, but it did give the opportunity to discuss the underlying principle of these