

January 9, 1996

reminding you that we do this every year, like clockwork. It's like a terrible nightmare that has to be gone through again and again and can never change. Even though you know that you're in this nightmare, there's no way you can change it to get rid of the horror, the anxiety and the other troubling aspects of it. You just have to go through it. I'm offering this amendment to spare you a little of that nightmare.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I rise in opposition to the Chambers amendment to the Wickersham proposal. If you were to adopt the Chambers amendment and then the Wickersham proposal you'd be faced with a situation where, on General File and on Select File, in the normal course of business, 30 votes would be required to adopt an amendment that is substantially the same as an indefinitely postponed bill. If you delete the third paragraph, as Senator Chambers' proposes to do, you'd be facing a situation where you had 30 votes required on General and on Select. But once a bill got to Final Reading it could be returned to Select File, and it would require just a majority of the elected membership to adopt an amendment at that point. I think that would probably...in using Senator Chambers' hypothetical, if you had a measure that had 27 votes, no more, no less, to attach an amendment that was substantially the same as an indefinitely postponed bill, you'd have the situation where it could not be adopted on General File, could not be adopted on Select. But once the bill got to Final it could be pulled back and the amendment would no longer be covered by the Wickersham concept of requiring 30 votes. So, if you favor the Wickersham amendment, I think to keep it internally consistent, you need to vote to reject the Chambers amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Will, consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds. You've heard that, haven't you? All right. His main argument is to keep it consistent. Many things are done and have to be done on Final Reading because it's only at that point that certain things are discovered. Final Reading is different from any other stage of debate. Senator Will, don't leave yet, I want to ask you a question or two.

SENATOR WILL: That doesn't surprise me.