

January 8, 1986

next divided question which is items five, six and seven of the code before you. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, one more year we are not ready for this I can see and so one more year I am going to admit defeat and withdraw the remainder of the suggestions to you and see if we can't further refine them.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers. Oh, excuse me, Senator, they are withdrawn. I am sorry, I didn't understand that. Another motion on the desk. The call of the house is raised. Thank you, Senator.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next motion I have with regards to adoption of the permanent rules is a motion by the Rules Committee. Senator, the one I have before me is the one that pertains to constitutional amendments, treating them as bills.

PRESIDENT: Senator Morehead.

SENATOR MOREHEAD: Mr. President, could I ask the Clerk to pass around or have a Page pass around the packets to the individual members. I am sorry, we have held these packets for the membership because I anticipated that the debate on the Code of Ethics would progress a little longer and I didn't want it to get lost in the paper shuffle on your desks. So if we will just hold a minute, the Clerk has them. Until you have a copy in front of you, you will be able to follow I think more carefully the things that have come proposed from the Rules Committee. This is a proposal that, the first one, that grew out of a situation which occurred on the floor last year, and I am sure that Senator DeCamp will recall it very clearly, in which we had a disagreement as to whether proposed constitutional amendments should be treated as bills or not when it came to the vote to resurrect from committee on an indefinite postponement by the committee. The gist of this rule clarification is to make it very clear that proposed constitutional amendments will, in fact, be treated as bills and the required number of votes will then be 30 to resurrect from a committee after it has been indefinitely postponed. There was a conflict between two sections of the rules, and I think if you would like clarification in detail, Senator DeCamp could probably clarify how that