

January 8, 1990

bill out is where we were at with this bill, and this would happen again with the amendment. And so I guess it would be incumbent on the committee then to pull itself back together, I guess, before the eight days are up, and I guess pull the bill back in if you didn't have the concept worked out. So I guess it would...I mean that is how you would have to handle it, but this would change how we do things in committees. You would have to be much more cognizant of timing and be much more cognizant of how long you have to deal with this. The other problem we had with Senator Lamb's bill is we passed sixteen bills that day. We had sixteen bills I had to find amendments to and report statements on, and none of the rest did we have to wait for things from Kansas. And so I am just trying to point out that there is some complexities here in handling it, and the confusion over this thing, it probably is appropriate to raise the issue and see if we can't clarify it, but it isn't as simple maybe as it seems, and I wanted to give you that background as to the scenario, again, of why this issue is being raised on the floor.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, we have an amendment?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to amend Senator Lamb's amendment. (Read Chambers amendment as found on page 193 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Legislature, and particularly, Senator Lamb, what this amendment does is to track the language in the beginning of the rule in subparagraph (a) where any vote for action to be taken requires a majority of the committee members. The way the language stands now it simply says final action shall mean an affirmative vote of the committee members to advance. It doesn't say a majority vote. It could mean a unanimous vote. It could mean just a vote of whichever committee members are there and votes. All this does is track the majority language that is already in the rule. And that is not to say how I feel about the rule one way or the other. I just want us to have it at least technically consistent.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Lamb, please.

SENATOR LAMB: I certainly would accept Senator Chambers'