

taken the valuable time we've taken and caused what I think is a perception to become reality to those folks that think that we sometimes sit down here and wait until we do think people are asleep. As Senator Withem mentioned, on a sleepy day he could have introduced an amendment to abolish the Class VIs. Well, I don't...I resent doing business that way, I guess, and I would rather have seen this come about in a different fashion, if it had to come about. And the point I want to make is it wasn't absolutely necessary to get it done this year. It could have been done next year. If this amendment is adopted, and I will vote for this amendment, it won't become effective till '95-96 and this was just totally unnecessary. The portion of the amendment dealing with the distribution of the in-lieu-of tax funds is a necessity and we needed to get to that. It didn't need to be tied to this. This is an issue that deserved to be considered on its own and to be debated adequately and to rise and fall on its merits and I just wanted to register my thoughts on that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, just...I had to push my light and respond just a little bit to what Senator Bromm said because I really do disagree philosophically and maybe it's being more years, I don't know. But, Senator Bromm, I think you're incorrect. It was very straightforward. I think if you (inaudible) members in the body, 49, 48 senators were here towards the end, probably a fairer hearing on this than we have on other bills during the session when there are only 38 senators here, because the others are gone. And some bills were one vote short or two votes short with 15 members absent. Was that a fairer hearing just because it was done on General File? Was it a fairer process at that time? I think there's arguments whether that would be a fair process or not, whether it had the best hearing of all senators. Is this a good process? I think you have to answer a couple of questions on whether a process is good. Number one, did the body understand the amendment? And I think, very clearly, the body understood the amendment. I think, very clearly, the body understands what this amendment would or would not do. Second of all, I would like to point out that it's not just on Final Reading, I think the thing that we need to be careful about is there are two rounds of debate that this bill is going to go through. It just went through the first round. It skipped