

January 17, 1996

well. And that's...that's the group of senators that I think work generally in the best interest of all of us in our state. That's why this very late, in whatever time I've spent in the Legislature, I've come to accept the fact and agree that the experience I have had has led me and forced me, in fact, to support this kind of a rule. And I think it's probably, if anything, long overdue.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Lynch. Senator Will, followed by Senators Crosby, Avery, Chambers, Maurstad and Beutler.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. Again, I rise briefly to oppose the reconsideration motion of Senator Bernard-Stevens. Again, this comes to the very core of the issue that we're talking about, which would be the ability to structure debate on a major proposal by allowing the Speaker to determine the order of the amendments that are taken up. I think that if you favor this rule change at all, you will vote against reconsideration at this point. Even if you are ambivalent about it, have not made up your mind yet, I would hope that you would vote against reconsideration, to leave the structure of the rule change in its current form, because I think that it is the most meaningful with this proposed change in it. And without it, frankly, we probably should not waste our time because this is at the core of the proposed rule change. I think we've had a good debate. There have been some good comments made indicating, especially Senator Lynch's comments I think are at the very heart of what this rule change is about, trying to add some additional structure to facilitate meaningful debate on the floor of the Legislature. As I stated when I opened on proposed rule change number six, there, by far and away the most common complaint or comments that I've gotten as Chair of the Rules Committee, have been with respect to a degree of frustration over the lack of the ability of the body to deal with what are perceived to be major issues. And the Rules Committee has tried several different approaches to address that situation. This is, I think, the most well thought out and comprehensive approach that the Rules Committee has come up with. I do think that it will streamline debate, while at the same time allowing latitude for those who might disagree with the amendments that are being proposed. There is nothing in here that would prevent amendments from the amendments from being proposed. Certainly I think that ample opportunity for