

January 11, 1996

make it two-thirds vote. Policy decisions that we've already discussed, in my opinion, amendments that are proposed to simply wear this body down, simply take time to the point that we feel we don't have any more time to spend on this rules proposal and will either withdraw it or it will be summarily defeated. And that's why subsection (c) is in there, is to allow the Speaker to get us to substantive amendments on major proposals so we have time to talk about them. Now, I realize that's a significant...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR BROMM: ..proposal and the body may not be ready to do that. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam Speaker, members of the Legislature, let me be a little stronger than that because I feel that I'm being very accurate. This amendment kills the proposal; it kills it for all practical purposes. With the adoption of the Maurstad amendments previously, there is no power that the Speaker has except to declare that there's going to be five important bills. But why would they be important? Why would anybody listen? What would operate differently? You'd still have to go to the committee chairman. The committee process would be the same. The Maurstad amendments assured that. The only thing of importance left in the bill, except the symbolic importance and maybe a little practical importance in designating five bills, the only real importance is that subsection that now Senator Bernard-Stevens is trying to eliminate, that is that allows the Speaker to give the order of amendments. And I want to make a very great distinction here. There's been some misstatement on the floor. That provision does not allow the Speaker to deny an amendment, to say that this amendment cannot be heard, if there is time to hear all amendments. People have been trying to tell you that, well, we won't be able to speak to the issue, we won't be able to put forth amendments. If, in an eight-hour period, there's time to hear all the amendments that are up there, they will all be heard. The question is whether you want to have the same situation that we had last year with the crime bill and with the welfare bill whereby many, many amendments that I can accurately say were trivial stood in the way of substantial technical, important technical and philosophic decisions and