

January 11, 1995

particular proposal and don't even waste the time taking a vote or trying to offer tack on changes, and let those who have an interest in it come together, draft some language and then offer it, because I don't think the controversy surrounds how and when we're going to offer rules changes. The question is what factors will guarantee and restrict the offering of those proposals and the amendments.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I wish that Senator Will would just agree, in the interest of time, and in order for us to try to reach clarity, we would just pass over this one at this point. I don't have the time to try to draft an amendment and incorporate it into the language that's here, and that's why I'm not going to try to do it. But if somebody else feels that they can and we should take the time to do it now, I will participate in the discussion and help in any way that I can.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. There is an amendment to amendment eight.

CLERK: Madam President, Senator Will would move to amend the Rules Committee amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I have an amendment to rule change number eight to clarify what the intent is. It would simply add a sentence that says that nothing in this rule would preclude amendments to the rules during the adoption of permanent rules, to clarify that this certainly...the intent is not and never was to preclude anyone from bringing an amendment, even an entirely new rule proposal to the table at this stage of debate, when we're adopting permanent rules. The...certainly the intent, as Senator Beutler explained very well, is to encourage members that have substantive changes to the rules to bring those to the Rules Committee in a timely fashion so we can have a hearing on them. But there...if someone has a flash of brilliance during floor debate and wants to bring an amendment that has never been considered by the Rules Committee, certainly this would not preclude that. That's what my amendment is intended to make clear.