

January 9, 1989

called and then invoking that rule and saying, I need my five minutes to defend myself. I think that situation is out of sync with our present rules, and if you do it this way, you, basically, load the rule on the front end after the person who has offered the kill motion has had his or her ten minutes. Then the principal introducer at that point in time, right at the beginning, has a chance and really a one-shot chance, unless they have their light on again, to give their reasons against the kill motion. That is only fair, and so it is to make sure that the introducer, at some point in time during the kill motion debate, has a chance to defend his or herself, and I think this motion is in order and I urge its adoption.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Warner, please, and then Senator Haberman.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would rise I believe to oppose the substitute and be supportive of the motion of the rule change as originally proposed by the Rules Committee for these reasons. It seems to me that we have all, in recent years, had occasions arise, where a motion to particularly indefinitely postpone, that the person who offered the motion would ask for a call of the house just prior to their closing, and in every instance, those who were opposed or the introducer who was opposed to the kill motion, as a practical matter, never had an opportunity to present their case to those who were going to vote, and it would seem to me that the only time this issue authorizes the way it was originally drafted where there was a motion to cease debate, and with a lot of people absent, it makes a lot of sense to me the way the bill was originally written, and rather than give the introducer an advantage, I think it takes away the disadvantage of the introducer of the bill now as it was proposed, and it would be a better way to do it. If there is no ceasing of debate, there is nothing that precludes the person who introduced the bill to speak if they choose to do so. The only time it is an issue is when debate has ceased, and when you consider this in connection with the tendency to have a call of the house, it seems to me that it is very reasonable that both sides of the issue have under the rules an opportunity to be presented to members who are going to be here to vote. So I would oppose the substitute and be supportive of the way the motion was originally proposed.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Haberman, then Senator Chambers. Senator Haberman.