

January 19, 1995

present it to you. I'm going to support it. It is up to you to determine in what way you think we ought to proceed.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. The Chair recognizes Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Ah, yes, members of the body, first of all, I take Senator Chambers' proposal to amend the rules in this regard as a serious proposition and I am going to respond to it as such. What he is attempting to do is to strike any provision in the rules as it relates to consent calendar. I would argue that whether or not this amendment passes or does not pass, what has evolved over my term of office here, not as Speaker, but as a member of the Legislature, is the ability of the Speaker to set the agenda, to special order, and to provide for a particular time limit for bills to be considered during the...in setting the agenda. That has evolved out of the Speaker's ability to set the agenda. Most of what we have, as Senator Chambers described as our procedures under consent calendar, the fifteen minute rule, for instance, what type of bills actually do go on, what type don't go on, has evolved and it is more of a custom than it is a formal rule. Having said that, I still don't think we ought to strike the language out of the rule, and also, Senator Chambers, having said that, also I am fully aware that any time I put a bill on the agenda as to whether it is consent calendar, special order, whatever it is, if there is a fifteen minute time limit on that, any one individual who, under the rules, can speak three times for five minutes each, can doom that particular bill. So I don't know as you need this rule change in order to see bills, as an individual senator, not you necessarily, but any senator doesn't necessarily need this rule change, in effect, to see that bills are not dealt with under consent calendar. I think what you are doing here is probably appropriately, at this point, pointing out to the membership that regardless of what is done in one area of the rules, there are still opportunities for members seeking to slow down the process to make points to do so. And I think it is appropriate that you do that. But I'd make two or three comments about consent, I've had some second thoughts about consent over the last few years on my own because there appears to have evolved a sense of the membership that once they get a bill placed on consent calendar that they somehow have a God-given right to see that bill automatically enacted into statute. And senators that do, in fact, have some concerns about those bills on consent are sometimes browbeaten to not raise those objections, and we have