

January 9, 1989

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, Senator Moore, Senator Withem, this is an attempt to bring a clean thing out of an unclean thing. That is impossible based on a comment by one of those old testament prophets, but what I will do, since I can't make it clean, is at least render it less dirty. So if you insist on accepting this bad proposition, you should at least put it in the best technical form or a better technical form than it currently is, so I am asking that you adopt this amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. President and members, I rise to support the Chambers amendment. As he says, that more graphically states what we intended to do, and I don't know if it is actually necessary, but if people are more comfortable with this language, that is fine with me, because it definitely spells out exactly what was the intent behind Senator Withem's and I's amendment. Now in response to Senator Warner and Senator Chambers criticism of this particular motion, I think the first thing I would like to point out is under our present rules, the way we have operated for a year, well, at least as long as I have been here, maybe not as long as Senator Warner and Senator Chambers have been here, but under our present rules, the principal introducer has no chance whatsoever to rebut. He has no chance whatsoever, and so if you adopt this rule, you are better off than you are presently. Admittedly, you are not, if you are the principal introducer, you don't have quite as good a shot as you would if you'd go with the original amendment, because then you could simply wait until all the arguments have been made, then prior to the closing you could rebut all the arguments that have been made. And the reason I am concerned with that is that I don't think it is fair for someone to use the rules, because in no other...when we are introducing bills, when we are introducing amendments, in no other circumstance can a person oppose the motion, wait until the end, and then prior to the closing, give his or her version of the story. In no other bill or amendment or resolution do you have the opportunity. I don't think you should on a kill motion either. I think it is only fair that we do add to the rules this rule because in that case, as we remember last year when the principal introducer did not have any chance whatsoever to speak