language introduced that would make it more acceptable at this point.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, as one who does study the rules and makes use of the rules, my strong conviction is that when we're writing the rules we are to be as precise and exact as possible. In logic, when you want to make an all-encompassing statement, you begin it with one of these three words, all, every or each. That then covers every item or individual in that category. If you don't mean all, you say some. So, if the rule is designed to say that some proposals, under certain specified circumstances, will be handled in such and such a way, that's what the rule ought to say. The Legislacure should not adopt the philosophy or the position of former Mayor Daly of Chicago. He would make all kinds of bunglesome statements which were contradictory, incoherent, inconsistent, and when reporters wrote the statement and reported it the way he stated it he would say in great anger, at his next press conference, don't write what I say, write what I mean. We have to believe that the person speaking is most acquainted with what he or she means and has selected the words that will convey that thought. We should not be asked to be mind readers or construers of the rules when, at this point, we're able to take relatively simple concepts, using relatively simple, straightforward language to say what we mean. Rather than try to get several concepts included in one sentence or one statement, it might be better to break this into two concepts, or three, or however many would be necessary. If we want to talk about those proposals that will be offered at the beginning of the session, which seems to have been the original intent of this rule, state that that those will be brought at least seven days before the session, if you want the Rules Committee to have the opportunity to conduct a hearing on them, prior to the commencement of the session. But make it clear that the failure of the committee to conduct a hearing, or to take final action does not preclude a member from offering a proposal to the body. Also make it clear that any rule presented to us, or proposal to change the rules is open to amending as any other proposal or question presented to us, and just go down the line and mention the circumstances under which rules changes will be offered and how each of those will be governed. What I would suggest is that we pass over this