

January 17, 1995

way. for all intents and purposes we have that ability now. Motions and amendments shall not be filed for dilatory purposes. I mean, we all know that they shouldn't be filed for dilatory purposes now. Sometimes they are. The vast majority of times they are not. That's...it is depending on whether you buy the drafters' definition of dilatory or the one that Senator Matzke just laid out because if it doesn't go to the merits, if goes to any merit of the proposal it does not fit the definition that he quoted of dilatory and for intents and purposes if you're taking things out of a bill or incorporating in, it's going to be extremely difficult to meet that definition. If you look at the principal, it says principal introducer of the bill/resolution may raise a point of order stating that he or she believes the amendments and/or motions are being used for dilatory purposes. We do that right now. We don't do it in that fashion, but we stand up and we oppose an amendment when it comes in. We say, nah, the only reason you're doing that is for purposes of delaying the bill, you're trying to attack the proposal, you don't like it, so we vote it up or down. We currently have that process in hand. The Speaker has the ability to decide whether or not an issue is in order and can exercise that. They have not because this body hasn't, I guess, affirmatively gone on record as saying it's something we want to take place, but I guess I would argue that the Speaker could exercise that authority now. The Speaker, probably last session, more than any in the...my recent memory, has functioned as a facilitator or a mediator, if you will, with regard to those folks who are on different sides of the issue. It is currently taking place right now. The Speaker can take issues off the agenda. We're not giving him any additional power than they currently have, than the office currently holds. A motion to overrule the Chair, with regard to other issues on this particular ruling, is, I think, that is where I think a real mess of problems could lie in this proposed rule change, but the issue of whether or not this can be done today is one that I think really is up to be questioned by this body. I would argue the components or many of the components that are incorporated in this bill currently exist and we operate under them. They don't come together all the time the way we would like them to, but I really don't believe they should and I don't believe that this proposal as it is offered is one that puts it together where it will work somehow better than our system currently does now. The issue of allowing the Speaker the kind of discretion, I don't have any problem with that. I wouldn't change my vote from the first day of session had this rule been in place at the