

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

January 13, 1999

at one person, but, you know, I got...the more I got to thinking about it, the farther it went, I decided that maybe I would want to use that thing myself, you know, to stop debate, and I didn't like to see it in place. So I never voted for it last year, and I think maybe some of the suggestions earlier that it should have been to the Rules Committee ahead of time and maybe have a time for it a little later, but if that's not the choice of the body, I'll probably vote to repeal it today because I did not vote for it last year. And I think that everybody can use it, and Senator Chambers is good at it, and I realize that and I admire him for it. But just today, the way that things is falling down, I think that I would vote to repeal it and go on, and we maybe can work out something better or different next year to make the system work better. Thank you.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. Senator Bromm made some excellent points with respect to the way legislatures work that bear very much on the way the Unicameral does its business. We start from the assumption that the time is ours, as much of it as we want. We punch our light. We're called on in order. Until such time as the group takes that away from all of us, we all have our individual rights. In other words, the time belongs to us. In other legislatures, the time belongs to the Chair and is parceled out in small dollops, five minutes for you, ten minutes for you, and that's it. You're done. You don't get up again. The Chair controls the clock totally. Since the Legislature in our state is premised on the notion that the time is ours, and we only have to ask for it, get our place in line, and then it's ours by right, it makes a very great difference as to how the rules operate. We have a very thin rule book. In fact, our rule book serves to facilitate debate not to cut it off, and the rules that try to foreclose debate are the odd man out. They are the sore thumbs in the rule book because our rule book is very, very deliberative, very open-ended, and it talks about the rights of members and what they are entitled to as to how they can get their right to speak. When we write a rule that tries to foreclose discussions, there is a lot of other rights in that book that make it difficult to carry that to fruition. Truth of the matter is, Ernie says, you know, I'm a wizard of the rules,