

Legislature. In judging from the temperature of the body for that discussion, Senator Withem was the person who, I think, sponsored the amendment that put in the summary. With that in mind, I was going to stand up and defend the summary. I didn't have a summary in my original green copy. At this point in time what I would suggest we do, let's have a vote of the body, see if you want to keep the summary in there. If you've changed your mind I would suggest that there's a little better way to word the ballot language, if the summary is taken out. That bill...that amendment has been printed, is already before us in another form. So, at this point in time, I guess I would hope that we could move to a vote on the Chambers amendment. If the summary, and after Senator Withem, who put the summary in, will support that, that's fine. Then we'll move on and I believe we then have a better way, if you're comfortable with the concept of the three-fifths vote, to suspend the reading. If not, all bills would be read. Thank you.

**PRESIDENT ROBAK:** Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Beutler, to speak on the Chambers amendment.

**SENATOR BEUTLER:** Madam President, members of the Legislature, it appears that this is all set up to go to get rid of the summary, but I remain unconvinced and I would like to make the arguments for a summary. First of all, I might throw out that historically, as Senator Warner well knows, there was a point in time, not so long ago, when the bill books that you have did not have a summary of the original bill and did not have a summary of the committee amendments. And I suspect that if you all look at it fairly honestly, what actually happens to you during the process, that you all have come to have great reliance upon and a high level of confidence in those committee statements that are the product of a change in the 1980s. I know that because when I first came to the Legislature we didn't have that, and I felt lost when a bill came up here on General File. Now, sure, it's possible that staff can distort it, but historically I don't think that's the case. I think committee chairpersons feel very responsible to put out a very objective summary when it comes out of committee. And I think that it would work that way also on Final Reading, and it could be very, very helpful to some people. But even if you didn't think that that was the case, you don't have to read the summary, you can do what you do now. What do you do now? Well, maybe sometimes you read the bill itself, you can still do that, or maybe sometimes you don't do anything at all. Well, then the question is, is the summary