

January 6, 1982

final passage because if the bill is on Final Reading and somebody wants to return it for a purpose, then the vote that is taken is while the bill is at the Final Reading stage but I have difficulty in accepting this amendment for some of the reasons mentioned by Senator Lamb. If the issue is still clouded, and I'm not sure that it is based on what the court did but if it is, it won't be resolved by a vote of the Legislature on a rule. If members of the Legislature feel that the Lieutenant Governor can vote for the final passage of a bill if it has a 24-24 tie and they feel that way because the super majority of the court did not say he could not, then adopting a rule to that effect will not necessarily make their point of view prevail. Because if the issue went before the court again and they saw that confusion reign, perhaps it would be a super majority but at any rate, if it's a constitutional question which is involved, we should not attempt to solve it with a rule change. Now I've got to have my pound of flesh. On that day when we were trying to consider what should be done with that bank bill, I stood on the floor and said it was a veto. Senator Johnson agreed. The Lieutenant Governor said it wasn't. The Attorney General said it wasn't. The Governor said it wasn't and the vast majority of the Legislature said it was not. So there I was, beaten down, trampled upon with spiked high-heeled shoes, made to crawl in the dust on my belly like the serpent, although I had not conducted myself as a serpent. I had been honest and straightforward and parsed the Constitution properly and the only ones who agreed with me were a unanimous Supreme Court and understand this, yes, there were a few other senators who were wise at that time, Senator Kilgarin too, but remember, the only point that the court agreed on unanimously was that a veto had taken place. Now the reason I am saying that is so that on occasion you may lend proper weight to suggestions that I make to you. I wouldn't be able to come back and say, "I told you so." Nothing can be so galling but in order that none of us will be put in an embarrassing position, I would like you to consider this question before you vote on this. Why is it necessary for us to even put this into the rules? If the principle will be accepted that the four justices gave that the Lieutenant Governor cannot vote, well that is what the case is right now and I don't see a need for us to put it in the rule. So I would have to vote against it on that basis.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would just like to comment that, Senator Chambers, you don't look too beaten down to me. It looks like you're going to have a good session.