

January 9, 1989

the better precedent for us to have spent more time on 775 during the course of the debate. We already spent quite a little time in the previous session under Senator Vard Johnson's tutelage to discuss the demerits of 772, and, finally, in desperation, Senator Vard Johnson just dropped it because there was no urgency to it. We are going to be faced with a multitude of changes to 773, but during the course of the debate on that bill, we couldn't get anyone to their feet. Senator Vard and I had some discussion. Senator Chambers had some discussion with Senator Vard, but there was very little debate. Ladies and gentlemen, mistakes that develop on this floor do not develop usually from too much debate or too much exposure. The errors that we make develop because of too little debate and too little exposure. Senator Chambers can be a thorn in your side and frequently he is a thorn in my side, but from time to time he opens a ray of light and that wouldn't really hurt all the rest of us to use the same kind of a system. I really don't know what it's about because, as I said, we can adopt the cloture rule and it sounds very good. I don't know how many times it's going to be invoked during the course of a session, but I would suggest that when the sum total of the Chambers pronouncements on the floor added up, Senator Chambers is going to have just about as many total minutes of debate one way or another. You can have it easy or you can have it hard. Now you are going to have to work a lot harder than you are doing at the present time if you think you can bottle up Senator Chambers with a mere cloture rule. It will sound good. You can go back home and tell the folks we fixed Ernie this time, but I have seen Ernie make too many end runs and there may come a time, ladies and gentlemen, there may just come a time when you might want to use the Senator Chambers tactics yourself. It might even be for a legitimate purpose, who knows. I think that any time that we really move to limit debate on this floor, we do not act in the best interests of the body. Sounds good. I admire the Rules Committee for trying to make an effort but it isn't going to work because even after Chambers there is going to be someone else who has the audacity to challenge the apathy and the complacency of this body and I hope for the good. I oppose the motion and I would hope that...I'm not even going to vote for the improvement because I don't want you to make it any better. I want you to take it the way it is. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: I have some more lights on, Senator Chambers, but we're just talking about the Moore amendment at the moment.