

January 17, 1996

and the Speaker alone, would be authorized to determine the order of amendments and motions.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, if the Speaker happens to be the introducer of one of these proposals and is not in the Chair, will the Speaker have the authority, prior to leaving the Chair, to schedule the motions and the amendments...the order in which motions and amendments will be considered?

SENATOR WILL: That would be my interpretation of the rules change, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, if we have a Speaker who is not running for the Legislature again, and one of these big shot operations wants some money from the state, that Speaker could schedule his own amendments and motions in such a way that no others would be considered prior to all of his having been taken up, isn't that correct?

SENATOR WILL: Yes, that's correct, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Members of the Legislature, I always look at the worst thing that can happen under a rule. At the federal level and other states, and I believe at this level it is not out of the question for a Speaker to try to feather his nest before he leaves the Legislature by doing a favor to some big shot organization. And that should not be possible under our rules, based on the way they are written, but it is encouraged, it is encouraged by the language of this Section (c)...this subdivision (c). I don't think any person, I emphasize it, including myself should have the power to schedule the order in which amendments and motions will be taken up. I'm going to turn my light on again and hear what kind of arguments are given in opposition to Senator Bernard-Stevens' motion before I speak further. But I want it clear that I am speaking in support of Senator Bernard-Stevens' motion to reconsider.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I rise in opposition to Senator Bernard-Stevens' motion. Essentially, what we're talking about here is a reconsideration of the prior motion that the body rejected, which would strike subsection (c) of the proposed rule change number six, which