

January 4, 1990

what that little beast was because he said, when he twitched his tail, then certain odors would fill, pervade the area. This particular amendment is not a good thing to have in our rules, and what I am offering is designed to put it in a position where somebody, if they want to try to justify it, could make an attempt to do so. If there is one nay vote on a motion to cease debate, then 25 votes would be required. I don't want to see any rule adopted whereby fewer than a majority of the elected members can cease debate, and I understand the frustrations. Sometimes I help contribute to them. So I am recognizing all of the factors that go into the equation. And even with all of those factors being considered, this is not a good rule. The one offering it has already told us he is not even coming back next year. Somebody said that if somebody steals your name, they steal trash but the evil that people do lives on afterward. Well, I am not going to say that Shakespeare had in mind Senator Frank Korshoj, but it could indicate that something he said does apply to things that will happen many, many years after the prediction is made. These rule changes are not essential and I don't think we ought to change rules simply because we can change them. This one, if adopted, would not facilitate the business of the Legislature, I assure you of that. I don't know whether I ought to go on and offer this amendment or not, but on the chance that the proposition offered by the Rules Committee would be adopted, I don't think it should take five people voting no to require a majority to cease debate. So the amendment that I am offering says, if on a motion to cease debate there is at least one nay vote, then a majority of the elected members will be required to cease debate.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Withem, please, followed by Senator Korshoj.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yeah, Mr. President, and members of the body, I am going to support Senator Chambers' motion. It gets me out of a further dilemma that I am in because I recognize both positions, the position, the need to expedite the business of the majority, when it is clear what the majority is, versus the right to protect the rights of the...the interest of protecting the rights of the minority when they wish to make a strong statement. In essence, I think the way the process, and if this goes, maybe I would suggest a clarification amendment to make the process one of unanimous consent as opposed to one negative vote on the board, because that is, in effect, what we are doing. And this does protect the right of the individual