problem sitting here this morning with the Newell amendment passing rules for the next Legislature 2 years away. I think Senator Newell's proposition has merit, and I commend him for bringing it to this body. I think it's debatable, and it should be debated and discussed, and the pros and cons brought out, but I concur with Senator Marsh in that it seems to me we're taking up time in the existing Legislature on something that will not affect the existing Legislature but will affect the next Legislature, and I question whether we can bind the next Legislature anyway by anything what we do today 2 years in advance. So I think we ought to strike the Newell amendment and then get about the rule change itself and discuss the pros and cons of that specific rule change as to whether it has merit for passage or not.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: Mr. President and members, I certainly concur with what Senator Marsh has said. I sat on the Committee on Committees. All of these people are brought up before the Committee on Committees. It's not going to be any different that I can see, and a small committee, and some of these have nothing to do with some committees...I don't know where you would send them. I think the people are examined very well now, and just to put this off 2 years, whether this is so the rule will pass or not, I don't know that, but I do know it would just complicate the problem 2 years from now. I'm not only against the amendment that he...the amendment to the amendment, I'm also against the rule change. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Fowler, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR FOWLER: Well I would present one of the arguments for the amendment. When Senator Newell brought the rule change in several people told him...well we've already organized, and everybody got on the Committee on Committees because they wanted to have this function, they knew what the responsibility is. Some people chose not to get on the Committee on Committees because they didn't feel they had the time to work on it. It didn't seem fair to change the rules after the committee had been picked. So the suggestion was made to him that perhaps it would be best to make it clear for the next Committee on Committees that this rule change would go into effect, but it would not be fair to do it for the current Committee on Committees. So I think that is one of the arguments that he presents us. Now people are telling him it kind of cuts both ways...they tell him, well, wait till the new Committee on Committees is chosen and then if he waits in 2 years he'll bring it up and people