

January 8, 1990

and say I move to adjourn to a time certain. Takes 25 votes, as a maximum, to do that. And that is the option that we all have on this floor as we approach the end of the session. Now if we pass this rule change, then we are locked into a five day recess before that last day. And we may not want that five day recess, but it's going to 30 votes to suspend the rules at that time to eliminate the five day waiting period. So I don't...I just don't see the reason for the rule, because we have the option to do exactly what that rule says now, if this body cares to do so. And if we adopt this rule, we are reducing our flexibility in that area. So I would oppose this reconsideration and oppose this rule change.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. The gentleman from Waverly, Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd rise to oppose the proposed rule change as well. I haven't read any of the stories or heard any of the stories that this was some kind of a partisan vote, as I gathered from what people have said. Those of you who think it's a partisan vote I'll tell you you don't begin to understand the issue, because if you want to take a Governor off the hook, any Governor, you sustain their veto, they're on the hook, you override their veto they're off the hook. And if you want to stick a Governor, leave them be responsible for their vetoes, and that's how it's done. But...And I could cite you numerous examples that I've observed in the last 27 years where the most popular Governor was the one who had their vetoes overridden and they were on the hook very clear from that. That's just simply how it is. Finally, I would say that Senator Lamb has already pointed out the two things that occur to me. One is the situations still exist with the 90th day, whatever legislation is enacted that day, so you don't solve that problem in its entirety, unless you get 40 votes, I guess, to extend the session for that purpose, which is an avenue that would still be open under the Constitution, if you chose to do so. But the basic reason is these rules are in place to facilitate the discussion in the process of developing legislation. A rule to require a super majority on meeting time seems to me of no consequence when 25 people could very easily make that change, if they wished to at the end of the...at the 87th day, or 88th day without any problem at all. It seems to me that type of flexibility is much more appropriate and much more logical than to write into a rule that takes 30 votes to meet differently other than a five day recess. I'd urge that