

January 17, 1995

person's discretion was wise or unwise when we voted in secret ballot. The fewest moving parts, the best. My suggestion is a very general nonbinding definition of what is dilatory. Secondly, the giving of the Chair the power to rule on when the Chair thinks that actions are dilatory, perhaps by the Chair's own motion rather than by any of us and upon the Chair's action a one-time vote as to whether we sustain or don't sustain the Chair. Thereafter, I think the Speaker rules out of order people who try to make motions to overrule, people who try to trap him into making various decisions and start the reconsideration process. I think you can only do that basically by granting discretion. What I don't think you can do is write the perfect rule that prescribes every situation because that rule itself would become, as Senator Chambers predicts, the very way in which we will be stymied. The only way out, of my experience after 16 years, is to simply give an undescribed body of discretion to the Chair rather like the old Potter...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...Stuart (phonetic) definition of pornography. You know, well I can't define it but I know it when I see it. That's about what dilatory actions are like on this floor and the question is whether the Speaker's definition of what dilatory represents a majority view of us as well. The problem with the Bromm-Beutler amendment is that it's not simple enough for my tastes, although it goes to the right place. I'm not exactly sure whether I support it yet or not. The place I think it gets off track is when it tries to describe a process far too carefully when, in essence, you can't get away from the fact that it's really Speaker discretion that is going to get us out of these traps, if anything will. What you can't do is write a rule which people do not wish to use to follow for the purpose of making decisions, but want to use for the purpose of defeating the body's majority. You can't write a rule that people are trying to defeat and have it capture the people that are trying to defeat it. It won't do.

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

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I agree with much of what Senator Landis stated and he touched on some of the things that I see in this rule that will make it a trap for the unwary and I know it wasn't written for that purpose. I could not have written a better rule to delay had I