

February 7, 1975

anything going across the board and we might want to get directly to General File on that day so he would not put any motions on the agenda for that day. So it gives him, I really feel under this, a flexibility but still the ability to work with the people that have the motions and get them out. It has eliminated the conflict between sections and so I would support this.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I believe everybody on the Rules Committee is very serious about his responsibility and I am equally serious about mine. I don't think that in the interest of a procedural formula, which is to allow the Speaker to lay out an agenda, we should make substantive rule changes. These changes that are recommended, I want you to understand, will automatically, when one of these motions is made, delay all consideration on the bill involved for one legislative day, not 24 hours even, but a legislative day. All that does is put off until the following legislative day what we didn't do today. If, as a matter of fact, the interest is in allowing the Speaker to make out an agenda and everybody in the Legislature indicates that's what is desired, let the Speaker use what he was given yesterday to lay out the order of business of the day. We should not pass rules with the idea in the back of our mind that they may not work and within a week or two weeks we may have to change them again. They continue to ask for a spirit of cooperation. Cooperation does not mean abdication of responsibility. They mentioned that this is to be a deliberative body. Deliberation does not necessarily mean slow. It does not necessarily mean careless. It means careful, proper consideration of whatever issue is before us. I don't think rules ought to be changed for trifling reasons. Now, I don't mean this is trifling in the sense of having no value or significance, but I don't believe these rule changes are necessary to accomplish what the Speaker wants, because they can lead to delays. If you have a bill on Select File and it's to be moved to E & R engrossing, then I can move to indefinitely postpone it. That stops your bill right now and it cannot be considered until the following legislative day when my motion is taken up. On that day I withdraw my motion. Then somebody else can move, on that day that same day, say two of us don't like a bill, or three of us. Somebody on that same day, since I withdrew my motion there was no action on it, so it's not a reconsideration. Another move can be made on that day to kill the bill. That motion is laid over until the following day and the bill stays there another day. So what these provisions allow is for one individual to cause an automatic one legislative day delay in any of these actions that would relate to a bill that might be yours. This goes beyond the power of the Speaker merely to lay out an agenda, it goes to a substantive portion, operation, and effect of the rule. We are not just dealing with a procedure here. If it was procedure it would merely allow, maybe, the Speaker to say we'll take Select File instead of General File, or vice versa. If we allow him to change the order of bills once we're on Select or General File that becomes substantive. When a motion of one person can cause a legislative day delay on any bill, in any of these situations where motions