

January 11, 1995

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I like this amendment. This offers better possibilities and prospects than what we have already and Senator Hall touched on it, but I want to go into something else. Now, Senator Will, let's say we have this committee amendment and it could conceivably be divided into 30 discreet parts but there is no division of the question. Without dividing the question I could still offer to amend each one of those parts as many times as I chose, couldn't I, while the committee amendments were being considered? Mr. Speaker, could you turn on the mike because Senator Will is making some very wise answers here and we don't want to miss any of them.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Senator Chambers, we recognize Senator Will so he can give his wisecracks back to you.

SENATOR WILL: Yes, Senator Chambers, you're correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now if we have gone through all of my attempts to amend the committee amendments and then the committee amendments are adopted, they become a part of the bill. Is that correct?

SENATOR WILL: That is correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And I could then attempt to amend them again as a part of the bill. Isn't that correct?

SENATOR WILL: Absolutely.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So what has been achieved by saying that if the question is divided you cannot amend the individual components other than to try to have satisfaction in saying you stopped Ernie from doing what he has been doing?

SENATOR WILL: I think the purpose behind the rule change, the proposed rule change, is that a division has been I think increasingly used by all the members of the Legislature, by many of them at least as a tactic to prolong debate and this is viewed as...well it doesn't stop any amendments from coming along, it just prevents it at the point of division to smooth the process somewhat.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But, Senator Will, here's what I'm trying to ask. Let's say that this committee amendment or any amendment