

January 8, 1996

SENATOR CHAMBERS: When would it take, if you are aware of any instance, 30 votes to amend an appropriations bill?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I'd have to look.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Offhand are you aware of any?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm not. That's why I'm asking, but I don't want to just state categor...oh, Senator Warner, may I ask Senator Warner that question? Senator Warner, can we pitch the ball to you?

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: I was going to say, I can think of one instance, Senator, but I don't think you would agree. If I had introduced a bill to fund such a program and the Appropriations Committee had indefinitely postponed that bill, which was a specific appropriation and did not include it...

SENATOR CROSBY: Time.

SENATOR WARNER: ...in the budget I would assume that that might come under this category, but that is seldom.

SENATOR CROSBY: There's an amendment to the rule. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Madam President, Senator Chambers would move to amend the rules proposal number four. (See page 279 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Chambers, on your amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, because there is substantial disagreement between Senator Wickersham and I as to how the word "substantially" would be interpreted by members of the Chair, I'm offering a substantive amendment to his to get rid of the substantial problem that we have in determining what "substantially" means if it should be offered in connection with an amendment. My amendment would simply strike the word "substantially" and we would have left "except amendments which are the same as any