

January 18, 1995

refusal to entertain such motions, or in case of doubt, submitting a question of whether motions are dilatory for decision by the body." What this does is offer an alternative approach to basically addressing the same issues that I believe that the Rules Committee has already addressed. I certainly am appreciative of the efforts of the committee but I think that possibly bring a fresh perspective to this...to this particular situation. I certainly respect rules and I believe it's the responsibility of all of us to be interested in them. I'm so much interested in the rules that I was even here last year in the gallery as you debated some of these very same issues. I was mailed the rule book, after my election. I went to the speaker orientation where Speaker Withem indicated that it would probably be a good idea for new members to begin to become knowledgeable in the rules. I attended the hearing that the Rules Committee held that discussed these issues. I have studied the rules and I've also listened to the debate of last week and of the first couple days of this week. This approach isn't directed at any individual or any groups. I wouldn't know who to direct it towards, either individually or as a group. And I also have no idea how this would affect me, because I have no idea how I might approach legislation in the future at this point. And so I think it is maybe a fresh approach with no baggage. I think it is appropriate that we indicate clearly in our rules that we state that dilatory motions are not condoned as an appropriate legislative procedure. I certainly trust the wisdom of the body in the election of the Speaker and expect that the Speaker will conduct business in a fair and impartial manner. Finally, to conclude, I believe that this amendment is a more...is a more direct approach to the issues that have been raised during debate and would urge the body to adopt this amendment.

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** Thank you, Senator Maurstad. Senator Bromm, followed by Senators Beutler and Chambers.

**SENATOR BROMM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate Senator Maurstad bringing this alternative to the body and I think it sets out as clearly as can be that this is an alternative. If the body wishes to adopt language like this, we are, in effect, placing a good deal of faith and responsibility in the Speaker. It goes considerably further than the pending rule change number 15 we debated yesterday in terms of giving the Speaker some discretion. The rule seems to follow the model rules fairly closely out of Mason's, which is a compilation of