

January 17 1995

being ruled to be dilatory by the Speaker at the request of other members of the body. But the ability or the enforcement of a conferencing between the Speaker and the people who are party to a disagreement on the floor I think is helpful. And so from the overall perspective, I am willing to try this version of amendment 15, and see if it does provide us with the opportunity to be more businesslike in our approach but still, but still reserve to the minority opinion of the members of the body the ability to provide amendments, either for the purpose of incurring more debate time on an issue or for making actual changes. So with that is my position on this. I am supporting it at the current time. Thank you.

SENATOR HALL PRESIDING

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Senator Withem, your light is next.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Mr. President and members of the body, I would like to make a few comments of a general nature. I am sure this is one where all us interested will have more than one opportunity to speak. First of all, as the Speaker at this point, this is not a power that I would relish to have. It is not one that I look forward to using. As a matter of fact, as I read this rule, and if it is adopted, I kind of dread the day when a member will raise the point that one of their colleague's motions are of a dilatory nature and that I will be placed in the position of having to make a decision. I would prefer not to do that as an individual. As an institution, however, I think it becomes more and more important that we have the tools available to us to work the will of the citizens of our state to do the job that we've been sent down here to do. Because we are a Unicameral, and I think Senator Coordsen was hitting on this, we do have probably a greater obligation to look at this balance of the ability of the minority to impact legislation versus the ability of the majority at some point to be able to work its will. We don't have another house to temper our actions. It is important that we maintain that balance. For that reason, I would not prefer... would not like to see us go all the way to what is suggested in Mason's manual. I will, if I get an opportunity to speak later on, however, maybe lay out an argument whereby we could argue that we already have the ability to do this by our presiding office by our adoption of Mason's as our authority in areas where our rules are silent. I prefer us not to do that. I would prefer us to have our own rule in