

THE PRESIDENT: Is there a second?  
(*The motion was duly seconded.*)

The motion is duly made that the calendar be approved and that the rules be suspended to permit the consideration at this session of Item 52 on the calendar. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor, signify by saying Aye; contrary, No. The Ayes have it. It is so ordered.

I call on Delegate Scanlan, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, Credentials and Convention Budget, and inasmuch as the report from Delegate Scanlan may be somewhat detailed, I suggest he come to the Reading Clerk's desk and give his report.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: Mr. President, fellow delegates, I have the honor of presenting the first report of the Committee on Rules, Credentials and Convention Budget. As you will recall, the report was distributed at the conclusion of our first session, our opening session on September 12. It has now laid over for the required two session days. I would like briefly to summarize it. Most of you, I am sure, have read it, and I will not try to duplicate the written comments you have before you.

With the approval, Mr. President, of yourself and the delegates, I would like to pass now but later return to the matter covered on the first page and a half of our report, that is, the material dealing with the proposed amendment to Amendment No. 5, and take up the report in the middle of page 2, where we recommend a clarifying amendment that turns out to be not a clarifying amendment. We were right the first time. The Parliamentarian has checked, and I would like to withdraw at this time at least the proposed amendment to Rule 20.

That brings us to Rule 20A [21], which is a proposed substantive change. Without reading the entire proposed new rule, that the Committee on Rules has offered for your consideration, I would like to say this. It is a rule that would put a limit on the length of time that a delegate can hold the floor in a discussion or debate. The limit would be fifteen minutes. However, there are a number of conspicuous exceptions to what at first blush might seem to be a restriction on free speech.

The first conspicuous exception is that at any time a majority of the delegates present vote for it, a delegate can extend his remarks. The second important exception to it is that a chairman of a committee presenting his report can speak longer than the fifteen-minute interval. Obviously some

committee reports will be very lengthy, and require extended explanation and discussion.

A similar privilege is afforded the minority spokesman in defending a minority report of a committee of this Convention.

I think in point of fact, it is a rule that hopefully it would never have to be used. It would be used, I think, at the one particular point where its use would be efficacious, in the closing days of this Convention when we are debating either on second or third reading when the minority, blessed with stamina and lung power, could make an extended stand. In the ordinary legislative body it would not make a great deal of difference. But, when you have a deadline, as we have, to get your work done, it would mean that in the end, provided the minority was determined enough and strong and persistent enough, the minority could require the majority to capitulate, compromise in a way that the majority otherwise might not want to compromise; but I think the ordinary case, most of the days of this Convention, if the delegate went over the fifteen-minute limit, very little would be done about it, and if he needed to get permission of the Convention, I am sure it would be given. The Congress of the United States has a similar rule in, I believe, the Committee of the Whole. For those reasons the Committee has recommended the adoption of a new Rule 20A [21].

Now we have also recommended an amendment to Rule 21 [22]. Unless this amendment is adopted, I am afraid not only the former governor of this State but two of its distinguished legislators, Senator James and Senator Clark will have to be expelled from their seats. As you will recall, Rule 21 [22] requires us all to be seated alphabetically. The change we suggest would legalize the seating location of Governor Tawes, Senator James, Senator Clark and the President. I assume there is really no great dispute about that.

There is a proposed amendment to Rule 24 [25]. That is the rule that deals with the Committee of the Whole. As the rule is now written, it restricts the Committee of the Whole from referring a report to any committee — I am sorry — as the rule is now written, there is some doubt whether a committee could sit when the Committee of the Whole was sitting. Delegate Chabot brought this up, I believe, in July and suggested that we ought to make it clear that the committee could sit if it got the permission of the Committee of the Whole. Otherwise, you might run into a situation