

January 8, 1986

occurred but I would like to move the adoption of this proposal.

PRESIDENT: Senator Morehead has made the motion to adopt this proposal which is being distributed to you. Senator DeCamp, do you wish to speak on the matter?

SENATOR DECAMP: Well, Mr. President, it never ceases to amaze me on an annual basis the Rules Committee spends about 60 to 70 percent of their effort and time and work on this floor trying to cut DeCamp off from some legitimate rule he found or followed, and once again we have the example here. The rules were very specific. You have a general rule about how many votes it takes to raise something that has been killed and then the specific rule that deals specifically with constitutional amendments or resolutions, and that rule specifically requires 25 as the Legislature determined, and the Speaker last session after thoroughly examining the rule books and the law determined, and so because some particular group, I guess in this case the Farmers Union, doesn't like the outcome of following the rules, we change the rules. I think the rules are clear enough. There is no ambiguity. I think they were followed, and if you are going to change it, then change it on the merits and let's hear discussion on the merits, discussion as to whether constitutional amendments which are treated separately in our Constitution in the way they are handled, the way they are proposed, the number of votes required, whether you think that on the merits they should have this rule change so that it requires 30 votes once they have been killed. I guess I think the 25 that is in the rules now is satisfactory and there is no need to change it, and I would simply say that possibly the Rules Committee could accomplish far more if they would direct some attention just to not worrying about what loophole this member or that member may have used or which particular technical rule he may have used and then try to close him off on or her off on it. So I don't care which way it goes but at least do it on the merits, the merits of whether this is a wise policy to change it or whether it is a better policy just to leave it as it is. My personal opinion is that it is satisfactory to leave it as it is. Why? Because on the merits, ultimately, that proposal, constitutional amendment, is going to take 30 votes to pass anyway when it reaches Final Reading. It has got to have 30 votes anyway so maybe there is no need to change it.