

January 17, 1995

SENATOR BEUTLER: And that particular provision then, I assume that under this language if it were offered by somebody else and you had offered it the first time you would stand and say this amendment is the same version that I offered, and I asked the Chair to rule it out of order. Is that what would happen?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right. Under this, that would be out of order, and the Chair could make a ruling without me or anybody else raising the point of order. But if the Chair did not make that ruling, then anybody could call that to his or her attention.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. So it's called to the Speaker's attention, the Speaker makes a decision, and that's that, no...the body has nothing to say about it in terms of overruling the Speaker.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, because the body would already have spoken with reference to this proposition in upholding the Speakers' having ruled it to be dilatory and therefore out of order.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. I think I understand it, and at the moment I don't envision what objection there could be to it, but I'd like to hear what other folks think about it. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Schimek, on the Chambers amendment. Senator Schimek waives off. Senator Witek on the amendment. On the original Bromm amendment. Senator Chambers, back to you on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, it should be obvious, from what I said, that despite the good feeling that I might have in most instances toward Senator Withem and toward the other people who occupy the Chair, should this amendment be changed to not just say that the Speaker will make these rulings but whoever is presiding officer, I am not going to leave the welfare of the people that I represent to the whim or the good feeling of somebody sitting in the Chair. When the rules are being drafted there is no need for us to say I want to establish legislative intent if, at that point, we're in a position to write into the rule what it is we're trying to say. Because the rule change, as being proposed, places so much arbitrary authority in the hands of the Speaker, and I do not trust any man or woman that much, I want to make sure that