

January 18, 1996

SENATOR BEUTLER: One, it is not my, it is not my amendment or rule change proposal to begin with, and in that sense I can not give you the intent of the introducer. Secondly, the amendment itself that creates the question of Senator Maurstad's amendment, I certainly can't give you his intent as the introducer of that amendment. My assumption, I make two assumptions. One, that probably there will never be a dispute and it is not a practical problem. But secondly, the assumption that I made was that since the rule change itself provides for no resolution in the event of a disagreement between the Speaker and the committee chair, then in that event the rule would not come into play since they don't both agree and we would revert back to the other rules that pertain in that event.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Beutler. And I agree with that. I would like to ask Senator Maurstad a question.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Maurstad, you look like you were in deep study, but I am going to ask you, at any point did you understand what Senator Beutler gave as his opinion in case of a conflict between the Speaker and a chairperson?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Senator, yes I did and...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you agree with his conclusion?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: The premise...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...of what I intended to do was to create a partnership between the Speaker and the chairperson on a bill of the importance that we are talking about here. So it was my intent, in the way that I look at this part of the rule change is that that partnership has to be there and they have to work out any differences if there are any.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But if they don't work out the differences do you agree that this rule change then will not come into play and in fact it can not and we will go back to the existing rules?