

January 18, 1996

SENATOR MAURSTAD: That I am not prepared to make a comment on. I don't know what else in our rules might come into play in that circumstance.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So at this point...

SENATOR MAURSTAD: My initial reaction would be that they need to get it worked out or it doesn't have this particular status.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So if at this point you don't necessarily disagree with what Senator Beutler concluded, and I agree with him...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...you don't necessarily agree with it at this point?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers, you may continue.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh. We can continue.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: My intent was to provide myself some measure of wiggle room, Senator, in that, not looking at it from an analysis perspective of how it might come into play with the balance of the rules, but, it would be my initial reaction that if they did not work it out then this super priority status, whatever we want to call it in the future, would not be able to move forward until they did work it out. I can't imagine that a hearing date or how the bill is going to be addressed would cause that. But...so I agree with Senator Beutler in the practical application. I don't think there will be a problem. But if there is, they need to work it out.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And there is nothing in the rules that declares that they need to work it out, is there?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Just as many times just the intent, it says what it says. It says, "The Speaker and the chairperson need to agree on a hearing date."

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But it cannot compel them to agree and it does not say explicitly what happens if they fail to agree does it? That is not contained in the language of the rule?