

for your decision.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Coordsen, members of the Legislature, I have been working with Senator Wesely and those who are interested in the bill and have tried to put together in one amendment, 3544, which has just been passed out to you, versions of two or three amendments that I had that have been compromised and put into this form and the other amendments dropped. What this amendment does now is three things. First of all, with regard to the plan, it just restructures language a little bit. It's a technical amendment, drops the words "recommendations for", so that the language says that you will submit the plan, not the recommendations for these things, but these things themselves, a change in verbiage that does not depart from the intention of the introducers of the bill. The second thing it does is also technical in nature. Senator Wickersham has a bill on civil defense agencies that changes the verbiage somewhat and the second part of this amendment simply proceeds to change that verbiage in accordance with the new bill. And, thirdly, it seeks to reach a compromise on the number of new jobs that will be outside of the Personnel Director. As you will recall, there are about 15 new positions. Of those 15 new positions under the new proposition that is represented by this amendment, there would be either 23 or 24 created, depending upon how the three departments were restructured, and so it represents a compromise on that particular issue. What I like best about that aspect of the amendment is that it reintegrates the whole regulatory structure of jobs created outside of the personnel system back into the basic statutory structure. So those are the three things that the amendment does, and I look forward to the discussion. Thank you.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President, and members, we have discussed this with Senator Beutler. These are essentially technical, the first two elements, but the last is the fight we had earlier this morning about the number of exempt positions. I'd prefer to have 30. The original talked about 15, and this is, in fact, a compromise. It's less than I'd like but it's acceptable, and I would rise in support of the amendment. I think it's a reasonable effort to accommodate the need for some flexibility without, I guess, going too far in some people's eyes. So I think it's a reasonable amendment. Thank you.