

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Madam Chair, members. This amendment merely strikes the 30 vote requirement. Senator Chambers said it was a good idea. We've had a lot of discussion on it, and I think you all know what the issue is, whether or not it takes 30 votes. The way the bill is now it takes 30 votes to have an...to establish an exemption. It takes 30 votes to remove an exemption. This would really...simply remove that language, and so we would go back to our own rules, and we would not put in the Constitution what...how many votes it takes. We could do that by our own rules, and under our present rules it takes 25, it's as simple as that. In my opinion, we should not have this rule in the Constitution, that's not where it should be. It should be decided by this body in our rules rather than having the people vote on it. That's what the amendment does. And I would relinquish any of my additional...my time I have left to my co-sponsor, Senator Chambers.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Lamb. Madam President, members of the Legislature, in a symbolic or, well, since this is the lion lying down with the lamb, if you understand what I mean, Senator Lamb and I are going at this from opposite ends. He doesn't like the first 30, which says it requires 30 to add an exemption. I don't like the second 30, which says it takes 30 to take off an exemption. So, although we're coming from opposite ends, we're seeking a common goal. I think, from the position that I hold, things would be worse if we keep this amendment than presently. I think there is a greater likelihood of being able to get 30 votes to put on an exemption than there would be in getting 30 to take off the exemption. So, if an exemption were on and it turned out to be one that I disagreed with greatly, I would have a better chance of persuading a number up to 25 to agree than a number up to 30, especially when it probably would get more than 30 to go on in the first place. So I think the status quo, 25 to put it on, 25 to take it off, is better than what this amendment would attempt to do. When Senator Lindsay and others initially talked about a supermajority being necessary to add an exemption, I agreed with that and supported it. But when we turned it around into the proposition that has been added to this constitutional amendment, the whole thing has changed. And now those who would be interested in taking away the exemption would have a much harder job than would exist without this amendment at all. So even though Senator Lamb is coming from one end, and I'm coming