

March 4, 1986

realize, by this tribute what the other members of the legislative body are saying to us. As position of the Rules Chair, I indicate to you that I think by strict reading of the rules it does say that the vice-chairperson ascends to the chairperson's position. The rules are, obviously, silent as to whether this is interim or during session, and so, therefore, I have concluded that it must apply to both. As Senator Labeledz has done, she has appropriately turned to Rule 2 for a suspension motion. I would assume that is because she does concur with the strict reading of the rules as they exist. So if you wish to change the precedent, then you will vote for the suspension of rules. If you wish to leave the precedent the way that it is, then I urge you not to vote for the suspension.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. Senator Hoagland, then Senator Vard Johnson, then Senator Chambers.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I would also rise in opposition to the rule suspension. These organizational decisions are always very difficult. I am always relieved when we put them behind us at the beginning of a 90-day session because it can stir up so many difficult feelings. We've all been through it. We've all experienced it. I know you all know what I mean. Now, I think it is a big mistake for us to change the ordinary procedure of the Legislature. Senator Marsh ran for the job. Senator Marsh won the position. All of us elected her Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board. At the time she was elected, this rule was in place, the rule was in place that says if the chairman resigns, the vice-chairman takes over and holds the position until the next regular session. Now, Senator Marsh has been a good and faithful senator. She's a hard worker, she's here all the time. She's a member of the hardest working of all committees, the Appropriations Committee. She is there all the time. She works the long, long hours. She's done a good job as Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board, and I don't just...I just don't see any grounds for changing. I think the truth of the matter is we all recognize that a vote to suspend the rules and to put someone else in that job, regardless of the merits of any other interested individuals, would simply be a repudiation of Senator Marsh. Pure and simple, it would be a repudiation of Senator Marsh. That is how it would be read. And I just don't see any justification for that. I think it is the wrong thing to do. I think it is an unseemly thing