

with experience and expertise to recommend to us to go or not to go with the claim but we are the ultimate determiner of whether or not that claim is approved or not. The public's voice is heard through us. We are the check and balance that Senator Lamb talks about and others that support this bill. There is no need at the review process to have any elected representative involved whatsoever. The Governor needs to be involved as the ultimate representative of the state government but even he is removed and all he has representing him is the elected officials that he appoints to those three departments. So even he is one step removed but, nevertheless, somewhat involved and ultimately responsible for the Claims Board. So now to interject elected people at this review stage is a serious mistake. It would divide that Claims Board once again. Even though a majority would be in order, you can see the sort of partisan bickering that came about when we set the tax rates. Always it's split on party lines and it just ended up being a mess and we changed it then and now we are going to the same sort of concept in the claims process. We changed the system on the Claims Board in 1981 because we wanted to get away from that. We ought to stay away from it. We ought not to approve the Chambers amendment, and even if it is adopted, I would ask you not to support the bill because it is a real mistake.

PRESIDENT: On the Chambers amendment, the Chair recognizes Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Well, Mr. President, I have read the amendment, and having worked on this claims procedure just a little bit, I would like to throw in one handicap which are the facts which I know we don't want to worry about. But you see the process isn't, the process isn't a unanimous board required to approve claims. I think if you will check you will find that it is only special claims, tort claims, that are above \$5,000 that involve the unanimous approval and I think with miscellaneous claims, I think if you will check you will find it is a majority. So we have a specialized area requiring the unanimous approval and that is above \$5,000, and whether that is the right number or not, I don't know. Maybe it is 50,000. But I think there should be just like in most systems a maybe stricter standard for certain types of claims above certain amounts. And I guess I personally have no problem with the amendment as long as you do a little research and get it drafted