

question, by our rules we could talk about that. And I would undertake the same opposition, even in the rules, to requiring a summary to be presented. Somebody has to write it, but in order not to take all of Senator Wesely's time, yes, under our rules we could take care of that, if the body felt to do it that way.

SENATOR WESELY: Okay, my thought on it would be then if we have that option, perhaps we shouldn't shackle ourselves with a constitutional provision and then see, perhaps, how that might work through our rule process. But I'd...whether or not it be presented, I think the concept of a rule that has a summary presented on Final Reading would be a wise thing to do, and then if it failed, I suppose, with a rule change we could always make a change. So I think at this point I'd support the Chambers amendment, although I'd like to hear the rest of the discussion.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Schimek, to speak on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I have appreciated the discussion so far, and I'd like to ask Senator Chambers, what exactly is the wording of your amendment, Senator Chambers?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schimek, it starts...do you have the Journal?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Um-huh.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I think it's in line 13, starting with "if".

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Right, you just strike that whole sentence?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And it strikes all that language through "vote".

SENATOR SCHIMEK: What if we were to, instead of doing that, just change "shall" to "may"?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I would still be opposed to it. See, I'm opposed to the idea of requiring staff to write summaries that will be based, supposedly, on the condition of the bill. I think it's unfair and unwise for us to inject staff into the