

January 8, 1996

SENATOR WILL: That's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So I could have an enumerable number of amendments through the amending process, whereas by dividing the question I would only have ten votes on it. Isn't that correct?

SENATOR WILL: Yes, that's possible.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And you would rather have the enumerable number of votes than the ten on the division of the question.

SENATOR WILL: Well, I guess it's a...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR WILL: ..it's a theoretical question, Senator Chambers. I guess, again, I think it gets back to whether the, from a strategic point of view, the individuals that would put together any sort of package would rather have the package together and go through the process that you described as opposed to having the package immediately divided.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Will, and we don't have much more time on my opportunity to speak, but I do have an amendment up there on this particular one, but I know nobody's listening, but those of you who are I want you to see what a foolish amendment this one is that you're going to adopt and I'm going to take some more time and rub it in. I'm going to taunt and I'm going to mock because I want it indelibly imprinted in your memory so that when I begin to do this at veto override time I'm going to have a copy of the transcript of this debate and I'm just going to put it in front of you and say read and weep.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Mr. Clerk, we have an amendment.

CLERK: Senator Chambers would move to amend the proposed amendment as offered by the Rules Committee.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The chair recognizes Senator Chambers to open on his amendment.