

January 4, 1990

individual would be. So, certainly, I am well aware of the rules of reconsideration, the advantages thereto that those rules can play one way or another. To the body, I would like to point out that this does not change for a very high majority of the cases the reconsideration process that we have. If there is an amendment that fails, you want to have it reconsidered, it will still take 25 because that's what the amendment would take. If the amendment would...I mean, those rules, for the majority of cases, do not change. What I decided last year was, in my mind, there seemed to be kind of an inconsistency that I wanted to bring to the attention of the Rules Committee, knowing that it would be a substantive change, and I wanted the Rules Committee to consider it and if they thought it was a valid thing to put to the floor, to have them do so, and they did do so and here we are today. And it was just basically the following. There are times in our body when we have questions that we put a very high priority on. It's very, very important. In fact, it's so important that we say you have to have 30 votes in order for it to pass. And the case that I was thinking of during the last session, it was on motions to suspend the rules. My feeling was we spent a lot of time on those motions and time worth spent because they are important. But the body knows that the motions are coming. They're printed in the Journal. They are important it seems to me it's equally as important that if the body then after all the deliberations that those major motions causes, because it takes 30 votes, the person that does the introduction knows it takes 30 votes, they're going to try to have all the people there and so on, to turn right around and say that just 25 then can bring that whole thing back doesn't seem to me to be equitable in regards to the system. If, in fact, it's important enough to have 30 votes, it should be equally as important to have the 30 votes for the body to say, yes, we do want to reconsider that. I might point out to the body that if we go back and really start thinking about the issue, that is not going to limit the body a great deal. And I would say to Senator Chambers, by the way, I know that if we pass the rule, that he would be able to use it, I suspect that I would be able to use it to my advantage or disadvantage, whichever way I would want to go, I would hope for the advantage as well as the Senator could and anybody in here could. I think a lot of us are trying to get as familiar with the rules as he is so we can at least compete in that arena at times, very difficult to do, but we are trying. Nonetheless, if you go back to your institutional memory, to the motorcycle helmet bill, it was on Final Reading. It did take 30 votes to have it