

January 17, 1995

year before, one or the other, he capitalized on the opportunity to follow motion to adjourn with motion to recess and pointing out there was no rule against that. So the Rules Committee comes up with something rather simple to try to give the Speaker a chance to deal with that obvious problem, which was viewed at that time by, I think, a great majority of the body as being sort of a ridiculous quandary that we were in. And if the body wants to reject this change, you know, that's fine, but please remember when we get into this problem, we get into this problem in two weeks or a week or tomorrow or whenever, that the Rules Committee tried to address the problem. The Rules Committee didn't dream this up. Senator Will indicated there were several members that came to him wanting the Rules Committee to try to solve this problem. Now maybe it isn't perfect and we could deal with this with further amendments, and I almost did that. I think Senator Chambers had a suggestion that would improve this rule change by adding the words, a motion to adjourn or recess shall be in order except, and that amendment would perhaps have been in order, but I guess I sense the body doesn't want to spend hours and hours on this, and I think this proposed rule change addresses the problem, basically, that we saw. And last year, it was brought to us by members. Senator Will drafted what he thought was appropriate. I think it is an improvement. I think to reject it is your decision, of course, but I think probably we will regret that. And we simply have to try to address some of the absurd results that we sometimes can find ourselves with if we don't have some rules to at least help us deal with it. I know you can try to get around this rule change, and if you are adept at doing it, as Senator Chambers is and as he says that he is, then you are going to find a way around any rule change. However, does that mean we just drop it and say, okay, we are not going to make any more rule changes we are not going to make any more efforts to improve the way that the process works here, and then just do away with these efforts. If that is what you want to do, then some of us won't have to spend quite as much time as we have on working on rules. But I'd suggest to you that this change is reasonable. A plain reading of it, it's workable and it will give the Chair just a little bit more leverage if somebody does want to use this tactic. The key words are "for dilatory purposes". If you want to move to adjourn for lunch, and it is lunchtime, I suggest that that is not necessarily dilatory. If you are hungry and there are other people that are hungry, that's a legitimate reason to adjourn. On the other hand, if that motion has been made two or three times in rapid succession, and we go motion to