

January 9, 1989

bill would make the motion, then line up all their speakers. The person who is going to be the introducer would then have to speak at the beginning because the one who made the motion would not have to give any argument as to why the bill should be killed. It would then be on the introducer to give an argument when no other argument had been given and we would have the situation where all those against the bill could then speak, move the previous question, and the introducer of the bill would not have a chance to rebut any of the arguments given. So I think in this instance, the first thought was better than the afterthought. There were people who thought that one of the dinosaur types used to have a brain at the lower end of its body, and some thought that was necessary because the body was so large it required two control mechanisms, but a clever poet had said that whatever it missed the first time, it would catch with an afterthought. In this instance, the afterthought is not as good as the first thought, if the intent of the proposal is to create a degree of equity for the person who introduced the bill. I think the first proposition that we find in the book would come closer to being fair, so I will vote against what is before us now on the sheet of paper that has been offered. But while I am on that, I think when we are drafting a rule, we should not leave anything to interpretation. If the proposition is designed to compel or allow the introducer of the bill to speak immediately after the one who offered the kill motion, I think the rule should say that, that after the motion to indefinitely postpone has been presented and discussed by the person offering the motion, then the speaker...then the introducer would be given an opportunity to speak. We don't need to have an ambiguous term such as "offered", "presented", or any other word standing alone. We may not always have the Clerk who is here now. We may not always have the person who is the Speaker. We may not have the members of the Legislature who participated in the drafting of the rule, and I think it would be to our benefit when we put things in the rule to have it say as much as is possible through the crafting of language what we intend to say. So, if you are insistent on adopting the substitute, I think an amendment should be offered to the effect that the person offering the kill motion would present it and discuss it after which the introducer would then speak, but even with that amendment, I don't think it is a good proposition.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Withem, then Senator Moore.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. President, to respond to the two