

January 17, 1995

whoever that might be, in session and talking constantly, sooner or later they are going to run out of gas, and that is how you stop a filibuster. I think we can try these rules, but all I anticipate us doing is hurting other people's bills. If that is the case, you want to be real careful that your bill is not located on the agenda right ahead of an abortion bill or a capital punishment bill or a gun control bill because your little innocuous bill might not go very far because those dilatory motions are simply going to be moved forward. I would urge us to be real careful when we look at this rule change to make sure that it is getting to what we are trying to get at.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. The Chair recognizes Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Madam President and members of the body. Very briefly, I would share with you this morning that early on in the debate I was adamantly opposed to rule 15 proposal to the rules, the number 15 rule change proposal as it was introduced. Primarily my reasons were this, that we are a single house system. We don't have as many checks and balances as exists in a two-house system where they may have the ability to debate an issue in various forms on both sides and then a conference committee in the event of passage in both houses of the Legislature to accomplish the task of making sure that what is passed will work and work in the way that it is intended. On the floor of the Legislature, there are times when each individual person here will find compelled to make a point that a specific issue is not going to work based upon their individual set of information. You know all of us know a lot about a lot of things, and everyone here knows more about some selective subject than anything else. So it is important that we have a system that allows a minority's point of view the opportunity to be heard. From time to time, I have seen our current rules used to that extent and then, of course, from time to time they have been abused for reasons known only to the person who was doing...making the motions at the time. I am in general agreement with the proposal as it is currently in place, the amended version of rule 15. I think that it leaves in place the power of this body to decide in finality whether or not an amendment or a series of amendments are dilatory in nature. I don't know that it is going to be much of an improvement in time saved over our current system. The only...it does provide a burden for the amender to make sure that they spend a little more time in drafting the amendments to hopefully keep them from