

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Hall, on the Chambers amendment to the Bohlke bracket motion.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, and members. I rise in support of Senator Chambers' amendment and I do so with the underlying purpose of supporting the bracket motion. I believe it is appropriate. I think it's fine to bracket it till Thursday and not until January. I have no problem saying, folks, go back and work on this issue. Clearly, it was a bill that was brought to committee. It had four votes to get out, I understand that. It's the only three-day committee where you only need four votes to get a bill out, and that's fine. But the amendment that we're dealing with is a rewrite of that proposal and it's one that's in conflict with work that had been done over the interim. There is clearly a conflict of ideas here, but not the principle idea that the bottom line is what's in the best interests of the children. I think it can be worked out. I don't think it needs to be bracketed till January. I think with some willingness to look at both sides of the issues instead of basically trying to attempt a ramrod approach, this type of a proposal could probably still pass this year. I don't have any problem saying let's bracket it for a couple days, get it back up, have people go to work between now and the time that it would be back on the agenda and then deal with it, and walk through it as long as it takes. The issue is not one that's worked out. I had a little gambling bill that was really pretty well worked out, couldn't get it up. (Laughter.) And it was worked out a hell of a lot better than this one, I will guarantee you. But the...and it didn't take any time off the agenda, not as much as this one has. But there are two sides to this story, there really are. I have attended one of those Foster Care Review Board hearings. I was invited and went to one. And I had nothing but the utmost respect for the individuals who were there. They were extremely knowledgeable about the cases. In most instances, they were professionals. They invested tremendous amounts of time in looking at what was going on. They brought me up to speed, which took a lot of their time, on the individual cases. But, in this instance, in this case, there was nobody there. There wasn't any of the family members, Senator Landis, there wasn't any of the professionals. None of the judges were there. The people that deal with it, the guardian ad litem, none of them were there. The fact of the matter is these people did, in essence, work in a vacuum, at least in that instance, and I would say that that is not uncommon either. But the fact of the matter is I do