

January 18, 1979

SENATOR CARSTEN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I am sure that those of you who were here before are aware of the fact that the timing of a proposed rule change is always in question, and at the close of last session I made an attempt on behalf of the Rules Committee on which I sat last time to make some recommendations, and ran into all kinds of difficulty with the theory that you could not bind the next Legislature by the previous one. I am still a little bit confused, but I believe inasmuch as we operate at the beginning of a session from day to day on the rules as we... as they are then printed, that probably now is the proper time to address this subject. I think that probably the amendment to the rule change, whether you agree with the rule change or not, is probably the important thing at this point. I think that at the opening of the next session then the rules can be addressed as they are then in effect to see if we want to abide by them or if we do not, and want to make changes then. I believe the timing is right and that we should address it. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I have served on the Committee on Committees for the past 4 years, and I happily gave it up to my good friend, Senator Newell, from Omaha to help cement relationships among that august body, but not really did I do that, and I say that in jest. My activity on the Committee on Committees I thought was going to be exciting, fun and educational. After I got by the first day of forming the standing committees that was the end of the experience and the fun. The rest of the time I found it to be a drudgery. At high noon everybody was ordering a brown sack lunch, eating icecream, cracking apples, eating popcorn and listening to people who traveled hundreds of miles, and then take a rubber stamp, put it on the back of your hand and say Amen. In the four years I was in there there were only two appointments that were under discussion, and this by Senator Chambers and I were the two people who opposed them. One was for a Parole Board appointment which was blatant politics, and one was for Fire Marshal, which again was the same idea. Beyond that point the Committee on Committees has very little function. If you're going to dictify the committee, make it meaningful, then you better make it a standing committee or you better follow Senator Newell's position. Senator Murphy and I were visiting a moment ago here. My idea was to make it a committee that would meet on Wednesdays, that has a position of honor and a position of dignity and a position to either affirm or not confirm, and we could do that...a standing committee to meet on Wednesdays like we have several other committees meeting on Wednesdays, and you'd have to reelect the