

laying over one day, to the point where that rule probably doesn't mean much anymore. But at least we do have something in our rules that maintains the status quo, and the constitutional amendment will merely allow us to do otherwise. We're always free to set other standards for ourselves, and those higher standards are in our rules. So, if you're not aware of that, you should be.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President, members. I rise in opposition, I guess, to the concept of eliminating Final Reading. I think Senator Warner makes a valid point. I think if we look back historically, when the Unicameral concept was developed we eliminated the protection of having two separate houses to balance off one another and give you the...to make sure that we had that ability to protect against things being rushed through without being properly debated or properly thought out. As the process has developed now we've already seen Select File move from being voted on to a voice vote. I would have the same fear Senator Warner would have, that not necessarily in the next year, or the next two years, or even in the next ten or twenty years, but down the road, without this we could see Final Reading turning into a Select File with motions being made very quickly and voted on very quickly. As we all know, sometimes on Select File we don't even know what we voted on when we yell out those ayes or nays. So I would concur that I think it's to me something that is a lot more than tradition, I think it's something that goes to the very essence of what we do, and the very essence of the deliberative process that we should be engaging in, in the Legislature.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, members. I'm going to vote for the Kristensen amendment, but I am going to vote, if that is what is still before us, I'm going to oppose LR 15CA. I appreciate the comments that Senator Withem made. I would only urge that as part of the discussion of the rules change, if this amendment is successful out of this body first and then onto the ballot with the people, that it should be looked at as it relates to the length of a bill. I mean one way to deal with this issue is bills of a certain length are read, other bills that are longer would be eligible for this kind of a provision, because I also believe that the need to be here, to be in ones