

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

January 10, 2000

Schrock's light is on next. Senator Schrock, do you want to speak to the first part of the divided question? (Legislative Journal page 189.)

SENATOR SCHROCK: I want to speak to the second part.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Brashear, would you like to speak to the first part of the divided question?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President, members of the body, I...I'm going to follow Senator Dierks' good lead here. I really don't wish to talk particularly negatively about any of our other fine committees, but I'm not willing to let this first division of the question go forward without speaking in favor of the substance and the totality of the rule change as proposed. Now, I suspect we could do the substance, which is the third part of the division, without renaming the Transportation Committee or without renaming the Agricultural Committee, and I'll leave it to others to discuss the renaming. But, as we are want to do, I want to urge the body to give careful consideration to the substance of the rule. I want to thank...I'm speaking for myself, personally, as just one member of the body. I want to thank Senator Wickersham for his interest, his responsiveness, and his suggestion. I want to thank the members of the Rules Committee for the hard work that they have done in addressing this issue. I want to challenge us to the painful process of considering changing something. Changing something is, oh, so painful sometimes. It's so much easier to do what we've always been doing. But I do respectfully suggest that the bills which all of you introduce, which you want your Judiciary Committee to consider carefully and to work thoroughly are in ever-increasing number. It's interesting to me when we use Senator Wickersham's data that we find that for the years '94 to '98, taking all of our committees as against or over against the entirety of our workload, every committee would have had an average of 60 bills for each of those years. Now, that's averaging all bills as against all committees. And the enormity of the problem as it relates to the legislation which you are introducing is demonstrated by the fact that the Judiciary Committee would have not only had its average 60, but we would have had 97 more to boot each of those years. And, if you look at 1999, you'll find that the average