

January 8, 1996

rule get here; why was it adopted? It will have been adopted because a majority of the senators voted for it. It...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...will have gotten there because there was not thought and consideration given.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Your light is next.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I would like to ask a question of Senator Will.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Will, since I've stated in general my rationale for opposing this, I now want to have a little more discussion of the rule, of the change itself. Did you...where did this rule change come from?

SENATOR WILL: There was...I believe there was a proposal that was drafted, I think it came from Senator Vrtiska to the Rules Committee, that was actually just the opposite of this, that was...that would have stated that such motions of veto overrides, of line-item veto overrides, would be divisible. The committee, after discussing it, decided that the rule needed to be clarified one way or the other and the Rules Committee came down on the side of making such motions nondivisible.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, when the committee was discussing this proposal, how much time would you say went into the discussion of it, if you have any recollection?

SENATOR WILL: The committee met two or three times over the last couple of months and I think this proposal, if I would...had to...had to make a guess, I'd guess we talked about this for probably 15 or 20 minutes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So it was not something that commanded a lot of attention, nor was it controversial during the deliberations of the committee?