

January 17, 1996

particular motion, to me, that provides you with anything that provides you with those titles other than Mr. President. I'd like to point out that we're only talking about five bills at this point in time that these rules, these extraordinary rules and these extraordinary circumstances would apply to. So, with that, I would ask people to keep in mind that this only applies to five bills. The Speaker, of course, not only has the expressed authority provided to him under the rules, but also the authority that's given to him just by the peer pressure, we'll call it, of the 48 other senators that provide him with some guidance over the course of the year. So I would suggest that we vote against this reconsideration motion; for those that have a problem with Section 6 then to vote against the measure, because without Section (c), I think the balance of it is just more paperwork for everybody.

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** Thank you, Senator Maurstad. Senator Beutler.

**SENATOR BEUTLER:** Mr. President, just two quick points. It was indicated on the floor that with respect to the slow-witted and slow-footed, it's just too bad for them if they don't get their amendments up there quick. And I think maybe that's part of what's going on here. Is that the way the system should be? I mean, is it not possible that some very bright, thoughtful people might want to take a little more time in formulating an amendment, go talk to some people in their district that they respect, get it just right, instead of putting something up there real quick? It's not necessarily a matter of being slow-witted or slow-footed, it's perhaps a matter of being careful. And the question is, ought the system to depend on who's up there first, on the accident of who's up there first, or on who's willing to be sloppy and put something up there first? Or should it depend on what are the more thoughtful suggestions with regard to amendments? And, remember, we're only talking about a priority that becomes necessary if something is being debated out to the eight-hour filibuster level; otherwise, we don't worry about it. So I would prefer the system that allows all thoughtful people to have equal access to the process. I do disagree with one thing, and I want to make clear that my interpretation of the rule is that the...is that the Speaker can be challenged immediately on any decision he makes under this rule because that ability of the body to challenge the Speaker is otherwise contained in the rules and there is nothing in this rule, at all, that would