

January 9, 1996

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Will, are there approaches that must be taken to bills on Final Reading which approaches are different from those taken on the bill at other stages of debate?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, that in itself shows that Final Reading, by our rules right now, is recognized as being distinct and different from the two earlier stages of debate.

SENATOR WILL: That is correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that being the case there is not consistency between the way we handle a bill on Final Reading now and the way we handle it at the first and second stage of debate?

SENATOR WILL: No, there...in fact, there's no consistency, even there are differences at each stage of debate.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, the hobgoblin of small minds does not exist currently, does it?

SENATOR WILL: Not in all instances, no.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, if your strongest appeal is to consistency, you haven't really given a very strong argument, have you?

SENATOR WILL: I would argue that I have, because I think that the consistency that I'm talking of is the concept embodied by Senator Wickersham's approach, which is that of requiring two-thirds of the membership for an amendment that is substantially the same as an IPP'd bill.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Will, let's look at the internal consistency, if you will allow me to use that, to talk about a particular rule or a particular practice being applied instead of differing practices. Now, when we offer an amendment to a bill at any stage of debate, can that amendment be amended?