

time and I hope he stands by his guns and brings in the absent members.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schmit. Senator Conway.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Madam President. Again, this is a serious matter. It has not been evoked for a great deal of time, as some of our senior members have attested to so far, and maybe that isn't the position across the body but those who are opposed seem to be also the minority numbers that were opposed to the advancement of the bill as well and I think are tying that particular issue to this question. One of the things in our rules that I think is extremely important is that there are times when what one needs to advance a cause would be the majority of those voting. It's usually done at the lesser levels of debate, if you will, the General File amendments and those kinds of things. But then we start tightening up our system, we tighten up our system based on the fact that you must have a super majority in various cases and that super majority is always calculated against the number elected, not the number that happened to be here. And I feel that in a case such as this if, in fact, we're up against the gun to have the majority elected...or, excuse me, have a super majority of those elected and that is the vote count necessary, then it is not unreasonable to expect that that entire denominator of 49 be present to make that particular balancing act work. I think the theory is, for the most part, and most of the members I know are very conscientious. Can it be invoked in another whimsical way? No, because it's simply a motion and that motion...this motion that is in front of you needs 25 votes. Actually, what it is is a situation that the only time that I would ever see this being evoked would be a situation where you already have at least 25, you're forced to have a situation where you have to have a majority, a super majority greater than our 25-vote count, 30 or 33 or 40, if you will, and at that point since you are pressed against a much higher standard against electeds, then at that point you ought to have the right to evoke it. But some people said, well, people will be doing this all the time. The minority vote count will never be able to do it because you will have to have the 25 to invoke it, to begin with. And so, therefore, I don't think it's inordinate, won't be used whimsically, will only be used in a situation where the minority side of the issue can hold the entire body hostage simply because of the absence of a few members. And so I think it's a rational request and I think there has been times in the past