

January 17, 1995

can't start a chain...the ever running chain of motions to overrule the Chair followed by reconsideration of the motion to overrule the Chair, that's what this last sentence is meant to say, even if it doesn't say it.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's the intent.

SENATOR LANDIS: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But, Senator Landis, it's one thing. I would be willing to change the language to say any motion to overrule the Chair is out of order, but I wouldn't try to write a rule to make all the things you mentioned...

SENATOR LANDIS: I understand.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...explicitly stated as being also out of order.

SENATOR LANDIS: I certainly think the language needs to be redrafted if it's going to do what Senator Chambers wants it to do, because the language "no appeal"...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...(inaudible) overrule this provision certainly isn't clear. I still have questions about the applicability of it and whether or not it opens up additional procedural traps, but I'm listening, too, as the discussion goes on. That was a helpful exchange for me, thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. Senator Chambers pointed out something quite interesting to me, that it would appear that should this rule become part of our procedural rules, that if a person, certainly in the absence of the Chambers' amendment, wished to delay a bill that they were in opposition to, they could conceptually file dilatory amendments which would secure you a 24-hour delay every time they were filed. Would that be an incorrect statement? If you really wished...I would ask Senator Chambers the question, if he would respond.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Chambers.