

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

January 13, 2003

could kill the bill in committee.

SENATOR RAIKES: Right.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Hartnett. Senator Chambers, and this will be your third time on this particular subject.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, the Appropriations Committee, at the outset, could look at the areas where they think substantive legislation may be needed and they could have bills drafted, call them shell bills or preliminary drafts of what the ultimate may be, and let those be introduced. They will go to the subject-matter committee and the Chairperson of the Appropriations Committee could let the Chair of whichever committee a bill went to know that it is not necessary to schedule a hearing until they hear from the Appropriations Committee. At that time, the bill will already be there. Anything that needed to be put into that bill could be offered during the hearing by somebody from the Appropriations Committee, and we still don't have to change the rules to give them what it is they want. When I say that I don't want the Appropriations Committee to be given favored treatment, my remarks have nothing to do with the makeup of that committee. Other than Senator Wehrbein, I don't even know who is on the committee this session, and last session I only knew the names of two or three people. I'm looking at the structure of the Legislature, the nature of our committee system. Everything that Senator Wehrbein is saying goes not to being able to achieve what the Appropriations Committee thinks is necessary, but rather to what I would call legislative laziness. What we're being presented with is a question on the order of this: What is the easiest way that the Appropriations Committee can get its will without having to do any preliminary planning or anticipating what may be necessary to be covered during the session? If they don't have ideas at this point of what we're likely to have to deal with, some of us could give them those ideas and bills could be introduced. I have not heard a compelling reason given by anybody why we need to change the rules when everything the Appropriations Committee has talked