

January 17, 1995

order because it's in some version like what we were talking about before that was ruled out of order, and then you'd get that procedural trap of a motion to overrule the Chair, and that could go on for quite a while. But I see that in a different sentence from the one that says, no appeal may be taken to overrule this provision, and I don't understand what that sentence means. Give me that one more time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, and I can write it to say there can be no attempt to overrule the Chair. But, see, we have a second version before us now...

SENATOR LANDIS: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...of the original attempt, and this language was tracking the language in that first offering.

SENATOR LANDIS: I am interested in knowing not only what the intent of this language is, but actually what it does...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It would mean that no motion...

SENATOR LANDIS: ...what it does, what does it mean? What do you want it to mean?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...no motion could be made to...it would not be an order to make a motion to overrule the Chair. Let's say that the amendment says anything...

SENATOR LANDIS: Um-huh, okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and it's rule dilatory.

SENATOR LANDIS: Alright.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then somebody else makes the same motion in the identical language. If the Chair is brazen enough to say, it's not dilatory, then that's it.

SENATOR LANDIS: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I can grumble and grouse, but I can't overrule the Chair in that instance.

SENATOR LANDIS: And this last sentence is meant to say you