

January 15, 1981

the process of doing all that, there will be numerous other proposals to come before this body. Now I think frankly I am getting as tired as most of the members of this body are at this whole discussion. I am getting very anxious to finish the rules. I have an opportunity as a member of the Rules Committee to listen to those arguments on an ongoing basis throughout the year anyways. I have heard them for the last four years. I am very interested in the rules and have brought rules changes into this body also but I haven't tried...my desire has never been quite as broad based as Senator Beutler's. So I would urge this body to consider just for one moment what we are doing. I also would like to make one other statement and that is, I have a motion on the board that would limit the number of rules anyone could introduce in any two year period to seventeen, very similar to the bill limitation number. Now that would not apply to most anybody except to Senator Beutler who has, in fact, introduced that many rules and I would hope that he would be supportive of that proposal when it is heard, read and debated.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Schmit. Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I guess I need clarification of what rules are in and what rules are out under this motion. For example, we worked out, the committee chairmen worked out a calendar based on a five day recess and we had to change a rule that said we would adjourn for a week, we changed it down to five days and that was done after the session started. So I would assume that under Senator Stoney's motion we would be back to a seven day recess and then committee chairmen would have to reschedule their hearings based on what had been done. They scheduled their hearings based on a five day recess, a calendar has been adopted, but if we adopt Senator Stoney's motion all those arrangements would have to be changed. We had a discussion on the chaplain. I'm sure you remember that, it was only yesterday, and a chaplain coordinator. Under Senator Stoney's motion the chaplain coordinator rule change would not be in. We would be back to the concept of the chaplain so we would have to re-debate that one. We adopted one of Senator Beutler's motion for a priority bill system. We debated that and spent a lot of time on that. That would not be in the rules and we would have to re-debate that at some future date. We did some technical amendments, one that the media of Nebraska wanted and I'm sure Senator Newell does not want Joe R. Seacrest to have to call us again and suggest that we have to reamend the rules to get a media amendment adopted. I appreciate what Senator Stoney is trying to do to get this question over but having invested what may be now ten to twelve hours in debate on the