

January 18, 1996 LR 17

would you, at the same time, consider changing the constitutional requirement that a bill contain only one subject?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, I would. That I would consider changing that provision so that it would be a...so that you could have more than one subject?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I don't think... I don't know.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schimek, do you think every senator on the floor who currently is a member, and those who may be members in the future, will exhaust every legitimate idea that should be incorporated into legislation within the parameters of 12 proposals?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, you would agree that there are legitimate ideas that could not be presented under the limitation that your amendment would impose?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I think what the amendment would provide would be a mechanism by which we focus a little bit better, perhaps, before the session even begins, that we pick out the ideas that we think are the most salient. I can tell by the look in your eye, Senator Chambers, that you're going to rip that apart really fast. (Laugh.)

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Maybe. But, Senator Schimek, so that people will know what I'm referring to when I say the "F" word, focus is the word that I'm referring to, because that's what was discussed so much when we were imposing a rule to restrict discussion, offering of amendments and proposals. Thank you, Senator Schimek, for now.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And I'd like to ask the Dean of the Legislature a question, if I may. Senator Warner, I'm not going to engage you in a deep discussion on this issue, but I want to be sure that I correctly understood something you said during an earlier discussion on a rules change. Did you state, to this