

January 18, 1995

SENATOR CHAMBERS: All right, and there is no rationale on which to base that decision other than purely and simply the tyranny of the majority. Isn't that true?

SENATOR ELMER: I don't believe that the tyranny of the majority that you envision would be imposed very often.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me make it softer for you. There is nothing in this to distinguish the allowance from the rejection of it other than the majority.

SENATOR ELMER: That's true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Isn't that true?

SENATOR ELMER: That's true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that's the rationale that is good enough for you, obviously. That wasn't a question for you to answer because your answer is in the proposal as you drafted it. I'm opposed to it.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Before we go on, Mr. Clerk, do we have an amendment?

CLERK: Madam President, Senator Bromm would move to amend Senator Elmer's proposal by striking in the new language the last sentence thereof. (Bromm amendment appears on page 334 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam Chairman, I am enlightened and my bubble is bursted and I'd like to amend Senator Elmer's proposal slightly by removing that last sentence to take out the...and certainly you can make the argument that a committee could abuse this opportunity to substitute their amendment for a bill and if one would...and that apparently could happen so we removed that possibility leaving the rest of Senator Elmer's proposal intact. So what I'm doing is taking out the sentence that says where you have a committee amendment that is offered as a substitute for a bill or a rewrite of the bill, it's nondivisible. We removed that language all together and that's all it does and at this point in time I think it would be wise to do that and then we can decide on Senator Elmer's proposal