

January 17, 1996

strikes the entire amendment, everything in it, which in some days past has raised the question of germaneness, but I think we should just argue these things out and see how the body feels about it. So it no longer has to do with scheduling or with ordering amendments or with focusing attention on principal bills. It has only now it's switched focus completely from what we've been talking about and goes over and talks about the dilatory amendment rule. And basically, the only change it makes is that instead of just the principal introducer being able to raise the question of dilatory amendments, anybody else could in the body, which in my opinion doesn't really expand the value of the rule at all because if there's anybody that's offended by dilatory amendments, it's, of course, the principal speaker. As an aside, I think the dilatory amendment rule has worked to a certain extent because the number of clearly frivolous amendments, I think, has declined dramatically. In any event, the reason that this will not help at all is because with respect to the part of the amendment that, that is.. has been under attack, that is the ordering of amendments, the question is not so much how do you deal with the dilatory ones. We have a rule for that. What's happened now is that little more thought goes into amendment and on a big bill, of course, it's very easy for somebody to think of a..of a substantive amendment even though it's very small in nature and inconsequential. So it's not technically dilatory, so that rule is hard to apply. But on the scale of things, we might all agree that that particular amendment is not nearly as important as four or five others. And so if...if we...if we leave what we're trying to do and just move over to the dilatory amendment rule, a completely different subject, we will have spent all this time, we will have invested all this time, and we will not have done anything substantial. I ask you to think now about the middle of the session and the end of the session, and I know you are, but to think about it really hard because we have a pattern that repeats itself. And especially I would ask the new people to think about it because they haven't experienced this. But the pattern is basically this, those who like the current rules and who flourish under the current rules don't like any change in the rules. And so at the beginning of the session, there is this horrendous scrap about the rules because it's a crucible. And those who like to operate under the current rules with all their defects know if they can just get past this bottle neck, just this point in time, if they can pass through the crucible then they can flourish for a whole another session