

January 11, 1996

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Will.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Will, I'm asking you this because you're on the Rules Committee, and even though I'm on the Exec Board, there are nine voting members and the head of the Appropriations Committee as a nonvoting, ex officio member, or whatever it's called?

SENATOR WILL: Yeah, I believe that's correct, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. And the Speaker can sit in, is that true?

SENATOR WILL: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. But we only have nine voting members. Thank you. And the ones that I would be talking about would be only the voting members, which means that instead of five votes to approve of this designation, it would take six. I believe that two-thirds of nine would be six, because there are three three's, and two of those three's would equal six. I think this is reasonable, that we would, since we're engaging in amendments that do nothing, and that's what Senator Beutler talked about earlier in terms of what could be offered on a bill, I'm just doing the same thing. But I'm trying to get the do-nothing amendment to at least have the appearance of rationality and reasonableness. When Senator Beutler finishes at the desk, I'd like to ask him a question, but I'm not going to ask it now so that he will hurry up with what he's doing. But the question that I want to ask him is, what change in our present system is worked if proposal six is adopted? The aspect of it... Senator Beutler, can I ask you this question, and I'm talking (inaudible)...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Beutler, will you respond?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm talking now only about subdivision...let me make sure, okay, subdivision (a), in the last sentence, "Determinations made by the Speaker pursuant to this subsection shall be approved by the Executive Board." My amendment would say, "by a two-thirds"... "by a vote of two-thirds of the Executive Board." But forget that amendment and just take the sentence as it stands now in the proposal. If the Speaker makes