

January 10, 1996

concerned and it's an essential purpose and that is getting amendments in front of the body that are crucial to the bill, that need to be acted upon, that should be considered one way or the other. Again, they would be open to amendments...to the amendments so any...any and all issues I'm sure would be discussed. It's just that there would be some ordering process to allow important issues to be brought up. So I think as we talk about giving power to the Speaker and the Speaker being all-powerful, it's important to bear in mind the actual parameters of the proposed rule change. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, Madam President, members of the body, as I indicated yesterday, I was not going to participate in this debate a great deal other than be available to respond to questions that people might have about the...how I might envision, at least for the next year, this process unfolding if it were enacted. Senator Landis, though, I just warned him that this is two days in a row now where he has made remarks that have got my juices flowing. In this case, in essence, it's going to be to agree with David and wouldn't you want to talk a little bit about our process, probably indicate that I still think this specific rule change adds some authority to the Speaker that would probably be useful to those interested in expediting the business of the agency...the Legislature. But I think I come down agreeing with him at the end that it's not going to make a big difference. It's going to be one...if you remember last year the dilatory rule change, spent hours and hours debating that, it was not imposed once. I mean this will be imposed because it puts an obligation on the Speaker and I will do it. But I want to talk just a little bit about our process. Senator Warner I think gave us some nice historical perspective. I'm going to give you some mid-range historical perspective. It does not go back to the days prior to limitation on number of days of service, but goes back to my days when I first came in the Legislature. What we're talking about here is how we resolve conflict and I've seen a shift of that in the years that I've been here. Part of that's because of the membership change. Part of it's because of the type of issues. Part of it, frankly, is because of our cloture rule which we never had before. It used to be, when I first came in, that first of all the proposal hit the floor and every member here would view that proposal as the property of the