

January 9, 1980

LR 30

of Senator Carsten's 1974 study on the rules. So we tried to review and get together all the materials that we could identify that anybody had ever done on the rules here and elsewhere and tried to make some sense out of the things that came to us. They then went to the 168 Committee as a whole and probably more than half of them were chopped out at that point. They then went to the Rules Committee and again, most of them were chopped out, so now we are down to the few that you are going to see today and tomorrow, but I did just want to tell you briefly, basically what our process had been in the subcommittee. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Kelly. All right, Senator Kelly waives ... Any further discussion then on Rule #1 of this package? We will vote then... Do you want to close, Senator Fowler? No close. Motion then is on the adoption of the approval of Rule #1 in this package. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record the vote.

CLERK: 46 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the rule change, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Motion carries. The first sub-rule for this package is adopted. Number two. Senator Haberman wishes to speak on this one so the Chair will recognize Senator Haberman on the second page rule.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Thank you. Senator Fowler, may I ask a question please?

PRESIDENT: Senator Fowler, will you respond?

SENATOR FOWLER: Yes.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Senator Fowler, from reading this, it is quite obvious that resolutions which propose rejection are not now considered the same as a bill. So, therefore, I would ask you, why is LR 30 being treated as a bill and held in committee at the present time?

SENATOR FOWLER: Well, Senator Haberman, I don't know if we want to discuss interpretation of existing rules but I would say that the rule change was brought in to clear up an ambiguity in the rules and by no means does bringing this rule change in do we state that specifically the rejection of amendments to federal constitution should not be treated as a bill. There is a disagreement within the body. There is a disagreement of interpretation as to

5684