

January 17, 1995

session when we have no mechanism for controlling the right to free speech in this body. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Chambers, you're recognized to close on your amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I'm going to ask you to adopt this amendment, then it will be a part of the overall amendment that's being offered to the rules. And if it's felt by enough members that this sentence, no appeal may be taken to overrule this provision, is not clear, what I would do is strike that language, and instead of putting a period at the end of the first sentence, I would put a comma and add the following words, "A motion to overrule the Chair, after a ruling, is out of order." And by putting a comma, it would be clear that this part, about not overruling the Chair, applies to what the first part of the sentence preceding the comma would say, and that it does not refer to everything in the rule, because there is a proviso in the original amendment that would allow the person who's propositions were ruled dilatory to try to overrule the Chair. So I am offering this amendment. If it's not adopted, it's not adopted. Whether it's adopted or not, I'm not in support of amending the rule in the manner suggested by the Rules Committee. There are other elements of the proposal that was brought to us by the Rules Committee with which I take issue. And I will at least discuss why I'm opposed to them. I don't know if I would try to amend them or not, because the amount of work involved is more than what I'm willing to give on this...at this point, because I think the rule, overall, will play into my hands, since I'm the one it's aimed at and everybody says this is going to stop dilatory amendments and everything else, I'll just show you that it won't. And you don't have to adopt my amendment, and the Chair can be blatant enough, whoever is in the Chair, to rule my amendments dilatory and then when a white senator offers it, say it's not dilatory, and that's exactly the context in which I'll cast it. How can it be dilatory for me but not dilatory for somebody else? Is it dilatory because there is a series of amendments, or is it dilatory because those amendments which are offered have no merit whatsoever? There were bills before us to which I attached numerous amendments and then supported the bill, and people were angry at the time. But then even the introducer, after they call...they said, well, yeah, this is an amendment that we need, we'll take this one. But when they look at a string of my amendments they say the only purpose for those