

January 14, 1992

I think as the Clerk would understand it, would be exactly Senator Chambers' interpretation, that is just what the language says, that during the discussion of amendments or motions then during that period of time you would be free to go wherever you want. You can go to your office, you can go back in the lobby, you can go wherever you want and the downside of that, of course, is that when we get ready to vote again then the Clerk's going to have to gather us all up again. So looking at it in terms of the expediency of the process and the freedom of senators and all the factors that I'm sure you're going to hear in this debate, the Rules Committee came up with that compromise. But what I want to get on record, and I hope which is what you will affirm, if you do it, I mean, I'm advocating that you adopt this compromise, I guess, but I want it understood that if you reject this compromise and there are no further amendments and the existing rule is left in place that the understanding of the Legislature is that there will be no limitations by the Sergeant at Arms, Sergeants at Arms or by the Clerk with regard to our physical presence, with regard to limiting our physical presence during the discussion of amendments and motions on Final Reading. I think that that would be the proper understanding should everything be rejected. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam Chairman and members of the Legislature, we are all grown men and women. Never have I, during the time I have been in this Legislature, attempted to offer a rule or supported one that puts artificial restrictions on us which need not be complied with anyway. One of the worst things that can be done is to set out a legalistic framework where you try to regulate every aspect of people's conduct when you cannot do so anyway. There is a lovely appearance if you want to present that to somebody but it will be observed, to use a cliché, in the breach more than in the observance. There is never going to be perfect order in a legislature. There is never going to be perfect order in a parliament. Wherever you have a collection of people elected in the way that we are, you presume that you have 49 individuals and we're individuals because each of us is unique, separate, distinct. We don't always view everything the same way. We perceive our duties differently. For Senator Beutler and the others who support this rule, they feel apparently that it's going to restrict the movement of the senators and keep everybody where they will feel