

January 17, 1995

says with regard to frivolous and improper amendments, an amendment that is frivolous or absurd is not in order, and the presiding officer may state...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...may refuse to state amendments which, in the presiding officer's opinion, are frivolous or absurd. The point I want to get across to you is that we are going to have a long, strenuous debate on this, and I hope you have the stamina and the will to move forward and cover at least partially a gap I think we all realize, from last year's experience, exists in our rules. We need to be a little bit tighter with regard to allowing amendments and motions to be used for filibustering purposes. That doesn't mean that we should cut off debate on any worthwhile amendment, but I think it is reasonable to give some discretion to the Speaker to make that decision about what is dilatory and what is not. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. The Chair recognizes Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, members. Senator Beutler, would you respond to some questions.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: If I can, Senator.

SENATOR HALL: The proposed rule change says two amendments, where did the two come from? I mean why...

SENATOR BEUTLER: It says more than two, Senator, under the version we are working with and I hope you have that.

SENATOR HALL: Okay, I am sorry. Okay, I apologize. Right, two, okay, so I am allowed, my allocation is two amendments before someone could argue that it is, or at least raise the issue that they have been filed for dilatory purposes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Um-hmm.

SENATOR HALL: Can you show me where in the amendment it says that both of those amendments or all three of those amendments have to be on the same stage of debate?