

January 14, 1991

SENATOR MOORE: Well, my answer to that is, no, quite honestly. I mean the reason I say that is as you already outlined, the Appropriations Committee goes through a much larger time frame. But I am as uncomfortable with the Standing Committee amendment as I am with an individual member on the floor offering an amendment. And this particular process would at least give us the opportunity, the Appropriations Committee, to explain their recommendation to a committee of interest. You know, I mean, obviously, if I had my druthers, if the whole Legislature would simply sign off on the committee recommendation, I'd be fine by that. But I...that's tended to be a problem around here in recent years at least.

SENATOR WARNER: One minute left, Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you.

SENATOR WARNER: You have one minute left.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: I thought my time was up. I apologize. Senator Moore, carrying on our discussion, our give-and-take, if you would, please, if you'd yield to a further question. Thank you. What we're basic...Would you be more in favor of this particular thing happening in a rule change, any committee, for example, that wish to have information on a particular topic or even area, a portion of a particular budget that they had an interest in, that they could call at any time and work with the Appropriations Committee Chairman to set up a time where the appropriate Appropriations Committee members and the appropriate fiscal staff would go and give all of the information that they had, if the committee so desired. And then, at that point, if they wanted to make an amendment after the Appropriations budget has come out, then they would have a priority amendment that would be worthy of a priority amendment.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, Senator, in my opinion, that's...

SENATOR WARNER: Time has elapsed, Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR MOORE: In my opinion, that's exactly what this rule does is what you outlined there.

SENATOR WARNER: Time has elapsed.

SENATOR MOORE: Obviously...