

January 11, 1996

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Before the body determines whether they want to adopt Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment or not, just want to talk through this a little bit and what the purpose of subsection (c) is. To the Rules Committee I think it seemed that it followed naturally that if the Speaker was going to be able to designate five or so major proposals that then he should be able to go ahead and give some priority scheduling to those items and determine whether or not they should begin to be talked about on the thirtieth day or the fortieth day or whatever's appropriate and, of course, that depends on if and when such measures ever come out of committee because, as we know, the committee still has control over the bill and could indefinitely postpone it. They could simply hold the bill or they could advance it to the floor. That's within the parameters of the committee for sure. Now, if we do have a major proposal come up for debate what the Rules Committee thought was that many, many times we have nonsubstantive amendments that take up a bulk of the time that we have to spend on that proposal, so it was our hope that the Speaker could not use his position to preference which amendments in his personal preference he'd like to talk about, but to prefer those substantive amendments that reflect policy decisions that need to be made and that could be talked about. Now, with regard to the rules proposal that we're on right now, as far as I'm concerned we've debated this rule quite a little bit. I think people understand the issues and I think we could, without too many more hours of debate, get to a vote and I think people would understand what they're voting on and I think that's important. I think we need to talk about that we understand what we're voting on so we make a halfway intelligent decision. I think we're getting to that point. However, I want to point out to the body, and I think... I want to say Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment, I think his proposal is a good one. I think it's a good proposal to talk about. I'm...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ..I'm not saying I'm going to support it, but I'm saying it's a good proposal to talk about. Following that, there are a number of other amendments to the rules proposal that I feel are going to be a regurgitation of the same issues that we've already talked about and that's what we always run into. Strike five and make it three; make it unanimous vote;