

January 17, 1995

CLERK: Senator Wehrbein voting no.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Hartnett and Senator Schrock, we need your presence on the floor.

CLERK: Senator Landis voting no. Senator Hartnett voting yes.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Jones, Senator Wickersham, Senator Warner, Senator Schellpeper.

CLERK: Senator Schrock voting yes. You had voted yes, Senator.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'd like to ask for a roll call vote.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Chambers has requested roll call vote. I do not believe all members are present yet, however. Who are we waiting for, Mr. Clerk? Senator Warner and Senator Wickersham, your presence is needed on the floor. Senator Chambers has authorized us to proceed. Call the roll, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See pages 319-20 of the Legislative Journal.) 29 ayes, 9 nays, Mr. President.

SPEAKER WITHEM: The Chambers amendment is adopted. We're back. It's my understanding, Mr. Clerk, we're back to discussing the original underlying amendment. Call is raised. Chair recognizes Senator Witek, followed by Senator Landis.

SENATOR WITEK: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I, too, have a lot of reservations about adopting this amendment, although I've been urged by many people on the floor to do so. But I think Senator Crosby was the voice of reason on saying that it gives too much power to the Speaker and that something like this could be done at any point during a discussion, people could go off the floor and discuss with each other what they wanted to do with the bill. It just seems to me that we should take a lot more time, maybe looking over this type of a tremendous rule change on the whole process. Really, it changes the whole process entirely. I guess what comes to my mind is over the last two years instances where this definitely would have happened either to myself or to some other freshman senator. And having a new senator come to the floor maybe with a