

January 11, 1995

be desirable to change the rule itself rather than merely suspending the rule to take care of some contingency at that moment?

SENATOR WILL: Yes, I think Senator Withem brought up the example that the makeup of the Appropriations Committee was changed at one point during the session. I think that would be an example. It's rare, but I think there are instances that occur that it behooves us to actually change the rule during the session.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, why don't we draft the rule in such a way that that is allowed to be done within our rules instead of having to suspend our rules? If there are activities that we can anticipate occurring because they've occurred before, our rules should embrace those occurrences. We should want to be as orderly a body as possible, that's what everybody was saying the first day. Yet at this point we want to create a situation where, in order to function as we believe we may have to, we're going to have to do it by suspending the rules instead of operating within them. Remember, I'm not the suspender of the rules around here, I'm the one who operates within the rules. And the others who don't like the way I operate within the rules want to change the rules and suspend them. We need to think at this point.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Madam President. Senator Will, would you respond to a question, please.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Yes.

SENATOR ELMER: Senator Will, in reading the amendment and reading the current Rule 3, subsection (f), the way the current Rule 3, subsection (f) is written it seems to imply that during the session, if the necessity should arise, the body can change the permanent rules during the session, while reading the substitute that we are discussing here it seems to imply that we cannot. Would you comment on that.