

January 11, 1995

divided portion of the amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Will. The Chair recognizes Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam President. There is a policy question here that for certain needs to be pointed out to the body and maybe the body wants to consider two alternatives. I spoke with Senator Will about this a little bit earlier this morning after reflecting on this proposed change. Let me try to explain it as best I can. Senator Will explained it very well that if we go to cloture and we have an amendment to an amendment pending, if the original amendment has been divided, under this proposed rule change you would vote on the proposed amendment to the amendment and then only on the subdivided portion of the amendment that is before the body and then you would vote to advance the bill. Now in one sense the reason to do that is that maybe the other subdivided parts of the amendment haven't received adequate and full debate and discussion and that's a valid argument. On the other hand you would have to ask in most situations why haven't you had full debate on those other subdivided parts? Is it because of the efforts of those who wish to prevent discussion or not have full discussion, is that the reason you haven't had time for a complete discussion? If that's the case, I'm not sure they should be able to hide behind this kind of a rule. So the alternative in my view would be to strike the proposed language of the rule change and after the words "a vote shall be taken on the original amendment" add "and all parts thereof" if the same has been divided. That would allow a vote on all of the original amendment that was proposed. But consider this. A committee amendment comes to the floor and somebody doesn't like it, they divide it into five parts. We spend eight hours talking about one of those five parts. We come to cloture. There's an amendment to one of those five parts that we're discussing. We go to cloture. This proposed rule, we'll vote on the amendment to one of those five parts, we'll vote on that one part and we'll vote to advance the bill. The other four parts of the committee amendment will fall out without being advanced and will have to be reattached later if possible. Now that is what I think we were trying to avoid when we instituted this rule change last year that we're dealing with here. The rule change last year, the language that was added simply says if the pending matter is an amendment to an amendment following a vote on the amendment to the amendment, a vote shall be taken