January 9, 1989

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And what would we do, ask the Clerk or the Chair to state that a person...the offeror of a motion has on his or her mind? We have to determine...

SENATOR LYNCH: I think we have an obligation to explain why we're offering a motion to suspend. That's the least I think out of courtesy we can do for the rest of the body.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm not talking about courtesy. I'm talking about a very bitter, acrimonious debate where we're staying just within the bounds of civility so that if somebody has a knife, they won't pull it, or a gun, they won't shoot it. So courtesy is not going to be a part of that kind of debate. If a person offers a motion, who can insist that they declare what their purpose is?

SENATOR LYNCH: No one.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So if you have to determine the purpose of the motion before a ruling as to whether or not it's in order can be made, but you can't determine the purpose, how are you going to rule the motion out of order?

SENATOR LYNCH: That does not, in my opinion, I believe, address what we're discussing in this particular amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Lynch. You will notice that he didn't answer the question because he knows the answer and it's obvious to all of you. We're going to get to that point if a cloture motion is being made where there will be bitterness and nobody can make a person say what their purpose is. So the Chair is going to have to say if the Chair is on the side of cloture, well, I rule that your purpose is this. Then there will be an argument about whether the Chair has the right to do that. And if they vote to go along with it, well, somebody can then vote to overrule the Chair. If you vote to go along with the Chair, then you just stand up and move to suspend the whole cloture rule and you have what you want. What kind of stuff is that? This rule itself is divisive. It can only be that. Senator Moore mentioned one example last year of a senator using some time to discuss for an extended period of time and then immediately said that this rule would have no impact on what that senator did. If the rule won't have any impact, then why use that as an example? You use as an example