

January 8, 1996

SPEAKER WITHEM: Technically, no, Senator Chambers. And I misspoke in talking in the popular jargon, as opposed to how our rules operate. They would still come as committee amendments...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SPEAKER WITHEM: ...that would still need to be adopted by the floor. The committee...this does not empower the committee to literally adopt committee amendments, but would allow them to offer a new subject matter in place of what was originally in the bill as a committee amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you for your question.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. And...but I understood what you meant, but I wanted it clear for everybody that you're not saying the committee, once it takes its move, the move is completed without...

SPEAKER WITHEM: That's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...action by the Legislature. Here's what I want to ask, though, and I may have missed this. Based on the language that's in the rule, that would be in the rule, the material that is put into the bill would only have to be under the subject matter, jurisdiction of that committee, not necessarily associated with the material that was in the original bill.

SPEAKER WITHEM: That is the essence of the rule change, very well stated.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: See, Senator Withem knows that what he is talking about is what I'd like to have available on the floor and everywhere else. And not just because sometimes it plays to my advantage; but as he was discussing it, things occur during the legislative process which will require some safety valve, such as this one. So instead of limiting ourselves unduly with restrictive rules, I am in favor of liberalizing the rules so that we can do the types of things under our rules, as written, which we need to do. Then we're not faced with forever