

January 11, 1996

order of amendments and motions to be considered, and that is where the mischief will occur. So, what I am saying, since the body insists on leaving this meaningless language in, let us just give it the appearance...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...of saying that we're taking seriously this change in the rules. And to show that we're taking seriously this change, we're going to require one additional vote in the Executive Board before the designation can be made by the senate...by the Speaker and it take effect, that a proposal will be a "major proposal" for purposes of triggering certain other meaningless things in this rule change. I don't think that requiring the two-thirds vote makes any difference. So, if you reject it, nothing significant will result; if you adopt it, nothing significant will result. Just as...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time. Thank you, Senator Chambers. To discuss the Chambers amendment we have Senators Will, Bromm, Bernard-Stevens and Chambers. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I rise in opposition to the Chambers amendment. Certainly this is a modified version, as Senator Chambers indicated, of what he was proposing moments ago in the previous amendment. Again, I would emphasize the fact that I think the safeguard of a majority vote of the Executive Board is sufficient for the way that the rule is structured. I do think obviously this is far superior to the unanimous vote of the Executive Board in the previous amendment. But still I believe that anything that is designated as a major proposal by the Speaker probably will be a controversial measure. And I think almost anything would draw one no vote on the Executive Board. I think it is.. if we are going to do this change in our rules, I think it behooves us to require a simple majority of the Executive Board because, in essence, we are giving the Speaker the power. The Executive Board does have the veto power, but I think that the veto power should be by a simple majority, just because of the fact that these proposals probably will be controversial, there will be any number of splits, urban-rural, business-labor, whatever, anything you can imagine, you know, that we deal with on a daily basis. Due to that fact, I think, the Executive Board ought to be in an ideal world making this determination based on the