

January 11, 1995

session, a member comes up with a new idea that hadn't thought of before, had not been referred, that would not be eligible for consideration as an amendment to the adoption of our permanent rules? Would that be out of order if today I'd say, my gosh, I looked at something in here and there's something I think needs to be changed, would I be prohibited from...Currently, if any change...the motion is before us to adopt the permanent rules, and I could take a motion up there to change any rule in this particular book. Would this prevent that from happening?

SENATOR WILL: No, Senator Withem. My interpretation of this would be that...and I would hope that any major proposed rule changes would be brought to the committee prior to the seven day period that is referred to in this rule change. But nothing, in my estimation, in this would preclude a member from attempting to amend any portion of the rules during the time that we are under the motion to adopt permanent rules.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Well, then what does the word, all proposed rule changes mean then in that case? I mean that's pretty specific language, isn't it?

SENATOR WILL: Yes, Senator Withem. And I guess in the...the intent would be that if...again, if there are substantive rule changes, by all means the Rules Committee, if at all possible, should be able to hold a hearing on them and have input, I guess. But in the absence of the rule, this rule change specifically precluding amendments at this stage, I think that that would not be accomplished by this.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Okay.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Will.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Bernard-Stevens. Excuse me. We have an amendment to amendment eight.

CLERK: Senator Chambers would move to amend the amendment, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.