

January 8, 1996

that might be interpreted to limit the committee's powers to do what most of us think committees can do as it is.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So your view is that the question was raised not because the terms combine and correlate may not be broad enough, but there was restrictive language...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...that followed which might have prevented what we're talking about.

SPEAKER WITHEM: That was my concern when I offered this, this amendment, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So by taking out the restrictive language, we're not, in a sense, saying we're giving something new to the committee, we're simply taking away a limitation that had been on the committee prior to this.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, and I don't even know that people would have interpreted this as all that restrictive, but there were some concerns during debate last year that it might, in fact, limit committees.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And I still am in strong support of this proposal. I haven't heard anything that would indicate that the rights of a member or the prerogatives of a committee or the Legislature would be harmed in any way. As Senator Kristensen pointed out, as long as your name is on a bill, you have control of it once it comes to the floor because you can pull it off the agenda. So I'm going to support this proposal.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Janssen.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Madam President, members. I believe that I'm going to support this, this rule change for the, for the simple reason that now the committees can amend a particular bill and still be within the rules pertaining to that, to that bill. If you take another piece, another bill that has had a hearing and amend it to it, which, as I understand it, this is the way you can do it with this new proposal. At least, for one thing, I heard Senator Crosby say that something that hasn't even had a hearing. Well, if I could