

January 4, 1990

missing something because I don't understand the need for the rule change, because it seems to me we have, we have the authority right now to do what we want to with the scheduling down toward the end of the session or any time during the session, that if this Legislature wants to adjourn for five days, all we have to do is vote to do that. We already have that right and that flexibility. What I see this rule change as doing is locking us into a position that maybe nobody on this floor or maybe we don't want. And then we have to come back and with a three-fifths vote we, I suppose we suspend this rule, if we don't want to do that. But then the majority is not being served. It's more than a majority that it will take to rescind this rule, if the body decides that there is no need to come back five days later. Maybe the majority of the people on the floor here want to continue and not recess for that period of time. My point is this, we already have the flexibility to do what this rule calls for, and so to put it in the rule book just takes away some of the flexibility that we already enjoy.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Smith, please.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the body, I haven't talked on...all day long on these issues either. But I can tell you that I've had the experience, and maybe I'm unique in here because no one else...I mean I've heard Senator Nelson talk about how, under this administration, she's had some bills that have been vetoed at the end of the session and she hasn't had the opportunity to come back in and try to have them resurrected. Others have talked about the other side of the issue. I guess I'm maybe different from the fact that I've had bills vetoed by both administrations, so you can't lay your finger on politics in this case. I think that I'm more and more swayed toward what Senator Wesely is trying to purport to us, though, because I don't agree with you, Senator Lamb. You just said that we have the flexibility, we have the right to schedule bills in here so that we can evidently bypass that veto opportunity, in other words, have the time to come back in. Well, if that's the case, then why do we have bills that were vetoed after the session adjourned last year? The thing of it is we, by our own maybe impromptu rules, have decided that we're going to hold up all of our bills that have an A bill attached to them until the very, very end. Remember? So, any of those bills that we have like that don't leave us enough time to come back in then and try to override a veto. So we don't have that flexibility. Okay, I wanted to make that clear that I disagree