

January 8, 1996

package them. I'm not opposed to that. Let them try to package any way that they choose; but, by the same token, our rule that allows a division of that question should not be changed. That particular packaging which would create a divisible question is not sacrosanct. Our rules should predominate over that. However, if the body decides that it wants to reject my amendment, that is the body's prerogative. But you are playing into my hands. I want you to know that. You are issuing a challenge to me on January 8, 1996, which I shall accept sometime in April 1996. Why are you adopting this proposal that Senator Will and his committee are presenting to you if you adopt it? Is it to save time? It's not going to do that. Is it going to streamline the process? It is not going to do that. So what is it going to do? It's going to do something just to be doing something, and nothing is more fun than to do the do because you're able to do it. On the other hand, I think a rule change should have an identifiable purpose. This one does not. I'm going to say a few things repetitiously now because I love to discuss the rules. Senator Will, I love to discuss the rules more than those little children on that K-Mart commercial said they love Christmas. The rules should be taken seriously by all of us prior to the time that their application is necessary. If everybody is more or less in accord on an issue, we don't have to resort to the rules. As a matter of fact, we can proceed in a way that is contrary to the rules. Until somebody, by way of a point of order being raised, calls attention to something, then we don't have to comport with the rules in what we do. The other day, had Senator Will not been alert and noted that I had not voted on the prevailing side but nevertheless offered a reconsideration motion, we would have discussed that motion to death. Then I would have brought it to the body's attention that I didn't even have a right to bring this motion and the rules would have prevented it if somebody cared enough about the rules to check them out. Fortunately, Senator Will was on the job. Today, we all ought to be on the job because the adoption of the rules is one of the most important things that we're going to do. Later on, when I begin to say I'm going to do everything within the rules I can to achieve a purpose, you will have to look at the rules that you all have adopted. What I am doing right now is allowed under the rules; and if there's any area of our activity which should be given extended, serious debate, it is our rules. What would my amendment do? I would call this the Chambers-Vrtiska amendment, except that his name is not on it but he did originate it. It would clarify this