

January 18, 1995

precedence, so if we don't change anything, we have that precedent which pretty much...which does follow what the Withem proposal is, but the Withem proposal puts it in the rule, puts it in writing and removes the doubt or the confusion about which way the Chair should rule under these circumstances. It doesn't...it doesn't, in my opinion, make good sense to have the situation of cloture and have a divided amendment which is may very well be a parliamentary tactic on those that divided it and to be able only to reach to the subdivided part for a vote before you move the bill on. That prevents you from getting to the substantive parts that you may want to vote on and that you haven't been able to get to. And so I just rise briefly in support of the Withem amendment. I would like to see that adopted and then the proposed rule change approved. Thank you.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Chambers, I believe your light is on again.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, we had a bill before us at one point which had been offered by Senator Landis that was amending something or other and there was an attempt by him to amend his own bill because he needed a certain amendment. Now here's the way I envision the operation of this rule. If a committee amendment comes out and it is a virtual rewrite of a bill and somebody is able to divide the question, and while discussing that division of the question we wind up with additional amendments, and so forth, which would carry the body beyond the eight-hour period and somebody would want to invoke cloture, it would have to be the introducer or the cointroducer with the consent of the introducer or the head of the committee if it was a committee bill, but, nevertheless, you reach that point. If the person who has a great interest in that has an amendment which must be attached, then this is a perfect rule to prevent that because after the proposition moves from the present stage of debate to the next one, whatever amendments had been offered would go right along with it. They haven't been adopted but they wouldn't lose their position, and that person would never be able to offer the amendment they felt was essential to their bill because you would reach the point of requiring cloture again. And cloture is the only means by which this bill, which is bottlenecking everything, logjamming everything, could be gotten out of the way. Now if a cloture motion is made and it fails, then you would have to have at least two additional hours of debate which would burn some time off the clock. So this may not be such a bad amendment for my