

January 17, 1995

place. More and more, as the issues that we are confronted with, become more and more contentious, the old standard of we give it our best shot and then we move on to the next issue have become not the norm. I've been as guilty of this as anybody. I have an issue that I care deeply about, I lay that issue before the body, I don't win on that, I have this desire to want to come back time and time again. More and more of us do that as these issues become much more contentious. Because of that, maybe the old system of letting an individual work their will with the bill and then moving on to the next item, it doesn't work as well as it did before. This is a rule change that the Rules Committee is bringing forward with the Bromm-Beutler adaptation, that I think we should at least try. When I was visiting with people about the speakership on an individual basis, and I would ask the question, what do you think we need to do to improve our process, this issue of dilatory amendments was probably the most frequently raised issue that I heard; that we, as a body, need a means of, yes, preserving the ability of those in a minority position on an issue to raise their points, raise their objections, to move forward with their arguments, but somehow to give the majority the ability to act. The balance is important, I keep coming back to that in my mind, and there are some examples that I wanted to use, as when Senator Dierks last year is the one I remember the most because it was my bill, it happened...

SENATOR HALL: One minute.

SPEAKER WITHEM: ...to be my bill, not because he disliked my bill but he disliked an amendment on it, was a case where he was able to express a point of view and, ultimately, to get the body to move in his direction. Senator Beutler did the same thing with the fertilizer tax issue. Any number of other people were able to do that. We need to preserve that ability in some way but not allow an individual to bring the session to a halt. I think, and I will explain later on, why I think what the Rules Committee has come out with now is a good balance. It allows the ability of the membership to work its will when it reaches the point but it does not, necessarily, take away that right of individuals to express their point of view and attempt to get their views enacted into legislation. So with that, at this...

SENATOR HALL: Time.

SPEAKER WITHEM: ...point, I'd like to indicate that I am, in