

ROUGH DRAFT

Parliamentary Process done

It was ~~said~~ said by the wisest man that ever lived that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. But equally true, we can say that parliamentary law and rules of order were made for human purposes, rather than that synods and ecclesiastical bodies are in any way bound to obey such rules. The rules are there to be a help, not a hindrance.

~~Anyone~~ Anyone who will visit almost any ecclesiastical body and see the motions made, withdrawn, seconded, amended, changed; ~~common~~ common consent as to withdraw a motion that has been discussed and debated on; changes of wordings; implications of words recognized only after a thing has been passed, and it is very difficult to change it; many actions taken that the majority regret having taken, but they did not realize their implications when they took them; the ~~much~~ much material printed in the minutes that does not express the will of the body as a whole, but merely expresses its groping as it attempts to find a solution to ~~way~~ a way to ~~express~~ express its will; will realize how very unsatisfactory the ordinary present way of handling meetings is.

Some would suggest that a solution for this is to have the members study parliamentary law and be ~~really~~ thoroughly versed in all its intricacies. Personally I doubt if parliamentary law is actually very applicable to the ordinary ecclesiastical body.

Someone has ~~said~~ also said that in the ordinary congregational meeting people do not often get their will done at all because they don't understand the procedure and know just how to use it. ~~My~~ My feeling is that there is question whether the ^{type of} procedure we are using is really suited to the purpose.

A hint has come to me from the common ~~practice~~ practice in the British Parliament of requiring that a bill go through three