

January 8, 1996

Chambers has requested a record vote. Please record.

CLERK: (Read record vote. See pages 278-79 of the Legislative Journal.) 25 ayes, 6 nays on the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The third proposed rule change is adopted. The Chair recognizes Senator Will to open on the fourth proposed rule change.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President and members of the body. The fourth proposed rules change you'll find in your packet also beginning at the bottom of page 264 and continuing on to the top of page 265. This is a rule change that deals with the number of votes required to adopt an amendment. Currently, at any stage of debate, the number of votes that is required to adopt an amendment is 25, the majority of the, of the elected body. And in addition, when a bill is on Final Reading, the vote required to return it to Select File for a specific amendment is also 25. Proposed rules change number four was brought by Senator Wickersham and what it would do is require 30 votes, three-fifths of the elected members, for the adoption of amendments which are substantially the same as any bill indefinitely postponed. So, essentially, I think this addresses the situation where a bill has been killed, most probably in committee, and the individual that had introduced that bill subsequently attempts to attach that bill as an amendment to some other measure. And I think the theory behind this is that a committee's action should carry some weight and for that reason a supermajority, in this case three-fifths or 30 votes, would be required to attach such an amendment. With that I would let Senator Wickersham expand on his reasoning behind this proposal.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President. I'm not going to spend a lot of time talking about the rule. I think Senator Will has laid out its purpose for you. It simply does conform to the procedures that we would now employ for bills that have been indefinitely postponed. Somebody asked me whether I had anything specific in mind when I offered this rules change. I don't. I don't remember exactly, during last session it occurred to me that we had somewhat of a double standard and decided to introduce the rule. You'll notice that the proposal