

January 9, 1996

covers the whole waterfront? Isn't that correct?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Perhaps.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Members of the Legislature, you are all obsessed with the idea of trying to save time. In the back of your mind, I believe, on every one of these amendments that you offer to the rules is an image of me. This time you'll stop me. This time you'll get me. This time you'll slow me down. But all you do, as I've said repeatedly, is play into my hands. If you're trying to save time, if you're trying to be efficient, if you're trying to get the biggest bang for buck, so to speak, the goal should be to cut down the number of steps it takes to achieve a result. Now, if I had a proposition that was contained in a bill that was killed, I know very well how to divide it into parts and offer those individual parts. Let's say that 27 people would be in favor of a bill that was killed by a committee. It would take 30 votes to pull it from committee, so the 30 votes are not there. With Senator Wickersham's amendment it would take 30 votes to add that bill, if the amendment is substantially the same, to add it as an amendment to a bill. But if I break it into two parts, or three parts, I have 27 votes for each of the parts, and we, by using two steps, will achieve what could have been done with one step. Those who support what Senator Wickersham is attempting to do would say, well fine, if you break it into a thousand pieces it makes no difference. The form is more important than the substance. And the form is that if a bill had been killed and an amendment is ruled by the Chair to be substantially the same as that bill, it would take 30 votes to adopt it as an amendment to another bill. Consider what we did earlier yesterday, which I think was a wise thing. By amending a rule we made it clear that a committee can consolidate a number of bills or resolutions.

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute left.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It can kill other bills from which the contents had been stripped and placed into that omnibus proposal which would be presented to us as a committee amendment. Now we turn around and say that an individual member or group of members cannot, without getting 30 votes, offer as an amendment to a bill that material which is substantially the same as found in a bill that was killed, makes no sense to me.