

SPEAKER BARRETT: Speaking to the matter of overruling the Chair, Senator Schmit, would you care to speak?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I rise in support of the Chair's ruling. I have the same deep respect for the institution as does my good friend Senator Bernard-Stevens. I appreciate his information for my purposes on the rules. I appreciate further his advice relative to how we should abide by the rules. We also provide for suspension of the rules, not necessarily, Senator Bernard-Stevens, for the purpose of protection from the majority but, as we all know, any one of us on this floor can and, from time to time, have, and I have participated in that event, tied up the work of this body. And so anyone who has any amount of intelligence, and you have more than the average as do most of my good friends on this floor have more than I do, but anyone can find a method whereby we can circumvent the rules and if you want a lesson in that, I'll be glad to participate and we won't even be on the budget when this 90th day comes along. Rules are made for reasonable people and, of course, when I'm on the side that is winning, then I think I'm reasonable. If I'm not on the side that is winning, then I'm unreasonable. But I just want to say this, that we have historically filed motions on that Clerk's desk and they've been taken up in the order in which they have been filed and, secondly, that there has not been, there has not been since the time the motion was filed, an opportunity to take up the motion, to my knowledge, without interrupting the work which was in progress. And Senator Bernard-Stevens had...we attempted to do so while the Lindsay amendment was being debated. I am sure with your knowledge of the rules, you would have been on your feet protesting that innovative use of...misuse of a system and, therefore, their only time, to my knowledge, and I want to emphasize that, that the motion could have been taken up after action had been completed on the Lindsay motion. Now you raise the question as to whether or not there was a date upon the motion. I do not know, but it is agreed when the motion was filed, the day following the Labeledz previous motion. It is in order. The rule book states very clearly, you have five days to take it up. It does not say you take it up immediately. It says you have five days in which to take it up. I suggest that when you read the rules, Senator Bernard-Stevens, you'll read the rules in their entirety, you read them from kiver to kiver and you do not just select that portion which happens to apply to that point of view which you propose. So, therefore, Mr. President, I strongly support the motion of the Chair.