

January 17, 1995

SENATOR BROMM: Well, unless you put the language up above that you spoke of earlier, adding "or recess" up in that preliminary sentence, perhaps you could, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Perhaps you could what?

SENATOR BROMM: Perhaps you could make the motion to recess.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, and the reason I wanted it that way so people would see that there is a distinction between these two motions, and in the first case, if I make the motion to recess and it is defeated, you cannot then make a motion to adjourn. That we agreed with if this new language is adopted, right?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: Correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is that the intention of the Rules Committee in adopting this change?

SENATOR BROMM: I don't think that was the intent.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right. Members, you all ought to be glad you all got some people who read these rules changes. Again, I don't care if you adopt it or not, but it will just give me another opportunity to gloat, to taunt, and to mock. Now you are in a good mood right now, and you'll probably laugh along with me, but when the nerves get frayed and they are sticking out the tips of people's fingers, and I come along with a board and I hit those nerves with motions such as this, you are going to be angry. But you have an opportunity to reject these kind of rules changes, and if you choose not to reject them, do the crime, do the time.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Since there are no further lights, Senator Bromm, would you like to close?

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam President. The...much is being made of this language, I think more than was intended by Senator Will and the Rules Committee. The purpose really of this change was to add recess to those motions that could not be followed by successive motions to adjourn or recess. And Senator Chambers, I am sure, recalls that as he pointed out in some of his comments on this particular rule change that last year or the