

May 21, 1981

from this point forwarded if it is adopted. On that basis I would have to oppose the rule change as it is proposed. I don't think that you can justify changing the rule on past action or effecting past action of the Legislature, although it might be appropriate when we all know that that is the rule in the future. So I oppose the amendment as a rule change at this point.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Vickers, do you wish to close on your motion?

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, as I indicated earlier I don't want to take up much time on this issue. I think we are going to take up. . . obviously I will probably lose because I didn't work the floor at all on it, I haven't talked to very many people but I can assure you that we are going to take up a lot of time the remainder of the afternoon discussing bills that we have already discussed at quite some length. I can assure you that these four bills that are going to be reconsidered are not going to be reconsidered without lengthy debate and lengthy discussion. As far as Senator Wesely is concerned about a bill that might be passed with some technical flaw in it, it would take the same number of votes that it takes to get this rule on the books for the rest of this session, of these five days, I'm not talking about the next session at all. I'm talking about the next five days. It would take the same number of votes to suspend this rule to bring that bill back and clean it up. As far as Senator Warner is concerned, he was indicating that this shouldn't be retroactive. Under the rules we have a day to file a motion anyhow. It seems to me that with the time restraints that we have here now that it almost has to take effect right now if it is going to be of any good to us whatsoever. Now, I think it is the body's decision to make. How much time you want to spend from here on out debating the bill for the fourth time. That is what it amounts to. We are going to have four stages of debate. Because, if this works, if this works, so help me, any bill that I don't like from now on I can certainly file a motion to reconsider, even after it has passed, bring it back and work it over some more. I don't think that is good policy. The reasons for the three stages of debate obviously are because we are a one house body, because of the check and balance system that we don't have with the other house. We do have the three stages. I don't think four stages are of any benefit. I don't think any parliamentary procedures to delay the actions any longer are of any benefit. I think once they have gone through these three stages that should be enough.