

January 14, 1991

to make four brief points that have been raised in the debate. One, Senator Beutler's point about the argument that we are somehow impeding free speech, that is not my point. I think the point of Meyer vs. Nebraska simply is that legislators in our Legislature have in the past passed legislation, such as the Meyer case represents, that is so adverse to individual and fundamental rights that it is important that we have free debate, especially on issues such as those. That is my point. The second point I would like to make is something that Senator Withem said. I believe he said that he would agree, could I get a gavel, Madam President, please. May I get a gavel, please. May I get a... (gavel). Thanks. The point that Senator Withem made which was that he would agree, I think he said, he can correct me if I am wrong, that he would agree to an amendment which says that if you are not successful in obtaining cloture that your bill would go to the bottom of the heap. Well, you know, that just makes the point. When you have an amendment or a bill that really isn't needed, number one, and doesn't make particular sense, number two, you put amendments on it to make it sound a little better. Well, if you don't win your cloture vote, then you go to the end of the line. To me that doesn't make any sense. In fact, I think it is inconsistent with the whole intent of what we are trying to do anyway. So the fact that we are talking about amendments to amendments to me indicates that the basic bill, itself, the basic amendment to the rules is not appropriate. Thirdly, I think it is fluff. I think we are playing to the crowd. It is another effort, I think, to try to show to the citizens that we are more efficient, but I would suggest to you that, as a body, that is not our job. Again, I say it, that is not what we are supposed to be here for. We are not here to be efficient. What we are here to do is to give the... provide to this state the voice of the people, and that sometimes can be efficient and sometimes not. It depends on the issue and we shouldn't impose upon ourselves on reasonable restrictions on our ability to represent the people of this state through debate. So I think we are kind of playing to the crowd. Fourthly, the point that cloture will probably not be used very much, well, that is just not a good reason to pass something, that it won't be used very much. In fact, when it will be used is at the end of a session when lobbyists have the banking bill or the insurance bill, money type bills, that they can't get passed because the session is closing to an end and we are talking about issues that rise to the level of fundamental rights, and that is when the cloture rule is going to be used because big monied interests are going