

January 17, 1995

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, where it talks about the challenge may be made by an introducer of the amendment, it would say again "any member". And if this were adopted, that sentence would have to be rewritten so that it would say that any member can challenge the ruling of the Chair, but that in this challenge all of the motions or amendments would have to be ruled on at that one time because I think the purpose of writing it like that, and correct me if I'm wrong, is to make sure that each one is not taken separately.

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is that it?

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. So can you tell me why in the original offering you were going to restrict the one who can raise the point of order?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Chambers, those were points that were discussed and there is a rationale for both positions. However, with respect to raising the point of order it seemed to us that the most order'y process was to limit it to the introducer of the bill because if the introducer of the bill doesn't object to the amendments and doesn't believe that they are being used, and he would be the one most concerned about dilatory amendments, he or she, and so it seemed appropriate to put that prerogative in with that particular person.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But if we are talking about a piece of legislation which now is before the body and the interest supposedly is not in that individual senator getting his or her way in terms of how fast the bill is being dealt with, but in terms of the legislative process itself, why allow one person to dictate what that process will be if that's what we're trying to get away from?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well the point is to get a fair hearing for a particular individual's bill and if, in the opinion of that particular individual, he is getting a fair hearing and is not concerned about the amendments, then there seemed to be no