

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

[LB92 LB160 LB162 LB254 LB262 LB285 LB346 LB374 LB375 LB381 LB417 LB418
LB419 LB420 LB421 LB422 LB423 LB424 LB425 LB426 LB427 LB428 LB429 LB430
LB431 LB432 LB433 LB434 LB435 LB436 LB437 LB438 LB439 LB440 LB441 LB442
LB443 LB444 LB445 LB446 LB447 LB448 LB449 LB450 LB451 LB452 LB453 LB454
LB455 LB456 LB457 LB458 LB459 LB460 LB461 LB462 LB463 LB464 LB465 LB466
LB467 LB468 LB469 LB470 LB471 LB472 LB473 LB474 LB475 LB476 LB477 LB478
LB479 LB480 LB481 LB482 LB483 LB484 LB485 LB486 LB487 LB488 LB489 LB490
LB491 LB492 LB493 LB494 LB495 LB496 LB497 LB498 LB499 LB500 LR2 LR3 LR4
LR7 LR8 LR9]

SPEAKER FLOOD PRESIDING []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the ninth day of the One Hundred First Legislature, First Session. Our chaplain for today is Pastor Todd Burpo, Crossroads Wesleyan Church, in Imperial, Nebraska, from Senator Christensen's district. []

PASTOR BURPO: (Prayer offered.) []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Thank you, Pastor. I call to order the ninth day of the One Hundred First Legislature, First Session. Senators, please record your presence. Mr. Clerk, please record. []

CLERK: I have a quorum present, Mr. President. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Any announcements or corrections for the Journal? []

CLERK: I have no corrections, Mr. President. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Are there any messages, reports, or announcements? []

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a Reference report referring certain gubernatorial appointees for confirmation hearing. I also have a Reference report referring LB288-355 that's signed by Senator Wightman as Chair of Reference. Announcements: Senator Hansen has been selected as Vice Chair of Building Maintenance, and Senator Harms has been selected Chair of the Performance Audit Committee, and Senator Nantkes as Vice Chair of that committee, those decisions made by the committee members. I also have hearing notices from the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee; the Agriculture Committee; the Banking, Commerce and Insurance Committee; and the Education Committee. That's all that I have, Mr. President. (Legislative Journal pages 197-200.) []

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SPEAKER FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do hereby sign LR2, LR3, and LR4. Members, you may introduce new bills. We will proceed momentarily to the adoption of permanent rules. [LR2 LR3 LR4]

SENATOR LANGEMEIER PRESIDING []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: (Doctor of the day introduced.) Mr. Clerk, any new bills? []

CLERK: Mr. President, new bills. (Read LB417-421 by title for the first time.) That's all that I have at this time, Mr. President. (Legislative Journal page 201.) [LB417 LB418 LB419 LB420 LB421]

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. At this time, we will proceed to the first item on today's agenda, the adoption of permanent rules. Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Lautenbaugh, Chair of the Rules Committee, would move to adopt the permanent rules for the One Hundred First Legislature, First Session, and any special sessions held during the 2009 calendar year. Pursuant to that offer, Mr. President, I have a series of amendments from the Rules Committee. Senator Lautenbaugh, the first change I have is regards to Rule 7, Section 4, et al. (Legislative Journal page 188.) []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. The Rules Committee did meet and we did recommend several amendments to the proposed rules. The first one would be number 1, obviously. The purpose, as it's stated here, deals with a motion to indefinitely postpone and allowing the introducer of the bill to speak for 5 minutes on the motion. Currently, the language is located under the heading: Shall the debate cease. It is difficult to find. This is really more of a housekeeping measure that puts the language where it more appropriately should be to clarify the rule in question. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You have heard the opening on the first proposed rule change to the adoption of the permanent rules. The floor is now open for discussion. Those wishing to speak, Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the body, I would urge careful attention by the members of this body to what's going on now. These are the rules by which this body will be governed. They have a great deal of importance, will affect you throughout this session, and for ongoing sessions. And so towards that end, I would urge you to carefully pay attention to what is being proposed to those rules...as far as rule changes to the rules. I do have some concerns that involve a few of these

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

rule changes and so I'll speak to those particulars as we go one by one through the proposed rule changes. But I would call to your attention what is going on now on the floor and just state that this does have importance. These are the rules by which you will be governed as you proceed as a senator throughout the duration of this session and into ongoing sessions, and will...has the potential to bind future legislative sessions decades and decades and decades from now. And so to that end, I just ask you to pay attention. With respect to proposed rule change number 1, I just have a quick question. I wonder if Senator Lautenbaugh would yield. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, would you yield to a question from Senator Pirsch? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Yes, I will. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Senator Lautenbaugh, I don't really have too much of an objection to the proposed rule change number 1, but I did have a question with respect...there's other rule changes here that I'll get into in a little bit that do. But with respect to adding this language, especially Rule 6, Section 5(d) at the bottom of proposed rule change number 1, why are you adding this additional language to that particular Section 5(d)? Was that...was there a problem, or historically has that rule been unclear before? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Senator, I think the concern was that the language was simply misplaced in the rules. These are the two places where it would apply on General File and Select File so it's merely a transplanting of the language that applies on a motion to indefinitely postpone. It's removing it from where it was before, which was kind of misplaced, and placing it in the two occasions with the relevant rules in which it would apply. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. And with respect to Rule 6, Section 5, that...and in particular, subsection (d), it says, that deals with motion to postpone indefinitely, is that correct? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Yes. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. And so, is there also within that section a reference to a motion to recommit? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Not in the proposed rule change, no. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Right. But I mean, just in general, within the rules. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I'm not certain. []

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. I guess my concern is, is there any reason...if there are other types of that of listed motions under that rule, I was just wondering if there's any particular reason to identify a motion to postpone indefinitely and separate that out from other types of motions with regard to spelling out specifically that the introducer... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: One minute. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: ...has to speak for, shall be permitted to speak for five minutes. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I believe the reason is that the language we're moving is language that is specific to motions to indefinitely postpone. So it is moved into the two other places where you would expect to find it on a motion to indefinitely postpone. It doesn't deal with any other kinds of motion because the language we're moving doesn't deal with any other kind of motion. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. Well, that explanation then sounds fair enough, and I have really no, little quarrel with proposed rule change then in this matter. I'll yield back the balance of my time. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Senator Price, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PRICE: Thank you. Senator Lautenbaugh, would you yield to a question, please? []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, would you yield to a question from Senator Price? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Yes, I will. []

SENATOR PRICE: Senator Lautenbaugh, I just want to clarify in this rules change here, as far as Rule 6, Section 3, how does that balance out to the change proposed in Rule 2, Section 10, whereby you'd be utilizing one of your opportunities to speak to a rule? And in rule change there, 3, you were saying, we want to reduce the number of opportunities to respond to 3. Would that count as one of your three? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I think there might be some confusion here regarding the upcoming rule. It is not a reduction of the number of times we can speak. It is a clarification of what has been the rule. There has been misunderstandings, I believe, as to whether or not the closing counted as the third time speaking, if you will. So this is meant to clarify that. So it's really a separate issue. That rule, I believe it's proposed rule number 3, isn't meant to change anything either. It's just to clarify the number of times you get to speak, which is what we've been operating under without the benefit of the

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

clarity of this proposed change. []

SENATOR PRICE: And how long have we been operating without this clarity? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: That I wouldn't know. I would assume quite some time. []

SENATOR PRICE: Thank you. I would yield the balance of my time. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Price. Senator Flood, you're recognized. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President, and members. This rule change was proposed to make this more uniform in the rules. Right now in Rule 7, Section 4, we have the paragraph on, "Shall the debate cease?" You can have a motion to cease debate on General File. You can have a motion to cease debate on Select File. You can't have one in any other stage of the proceedings and that's why we have the purpose of this rule being to deal with the motion to indefinitely postpone and allowing the introducer to speak for five minutes to the motion. Currently the language is located under a special heading. This puts it under the heading of General File, Rule 6, Section 3(f) and Rule 6, Section 5(d), General File and Select File. It's my position that this is a more logical place for the language and would make it easier to find. This does not affect anybody's ability that you've had in the past to cease debate on any given issue. It doesn't compromise your ability to stop debate. It doesn't help you to keep going. It makes no substantive change to the way we operate. If you have a substantive issue with this rule, I'm interested to hear it. I think right now we have a very simple housekeeping measure in front of us and there's no dirty tricks behind the black door. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Flood. Seeing no other lights on, Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to close on the proposed change number 1. Senator Lautenbaugh waives closing. The question before the body is, shall proposed rule change number 1 be adopted to the permanent rules? And this does take 25 votes. All those in favor vote yea; all those opposed vote nay. Have all those voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: 38 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of proposed amendment 1. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: The amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Lautenbaugh, as Chair of Rules Committee, would report on a proposed change to Rule 6, Rule 6, excuse me, Section 15. (Legislative Journal page 189.) []

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to open on the second proposed change. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. The purpose of this language deals with the votes required for the passage of a constitutional amendment at a special election or general election. This proposed language would clarify the vote requirements. It is not meant to change anything substantively. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You have heard the opening on proposed rule change 2. The floor is now open for discussion. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized to speak. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. I also don't have any problem with proposed rules change 2 as I didn't have any problem with proposed rules change 1. Again, our duty...why we were elected is to be here and to look at these rules and to examine the merit of each rule, and it isn't...if we get up and ask questions the matter of whether we think there's any dirty tricks to be played, there's no dirty tricks to be played. But these are the rules by which we are governed. And just as, you know, rules are important to any game you play, they are important here on the floor here as well. So with respect to proposed rule change 2, I don't have any objection to that. But I do think it is everyone's duty here to pay careful attention to what's going on on the floor and to look at the rules with respect to whether they make sense or not. So I would urge you to approve proposed rule change 2 as well. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Seeing no other lights on, Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to close. Senator Lautenbaugh waives closing. The question before the body is, shall proposed rule change 2 be adopted to the permanent rules? All those in favor vote yea; all those opposed vote nay. Have all those voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: 45 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of proposed amendment 2. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: The amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, next amendment. []

CLERK: Mr. President, the Rules Committee, chaired by Senator Lautenbaugh, would report on a proposed change to Rule 2, Section 10. (Legislative Journal page 189.) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to open on rule change 3. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. This rule deals with the number of times a speaker may speak to a matter. The proposed language would clarify that the introducer's close is included in the three opportunities to speak. This is how we have

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

been operating, it's my understanding and my recollection. This is just meant to clarify that that does count as your third time. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You have heard the opening to the proposed rule change 3. The floor is now open for discussion. Those wishing to speak, we have Senator Flood, Pirsch, Stuthman, and Louden. Senator Flood, you're recognized. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I will admit that when I looked at this rule change I had to look twice to make sure we were clarifying the actual procedure. And I think where you get caught up in this rule is when you're the introducer of the motion or the matter before the Legislature, you get your opening, you speak twice, and then your closing counts as your third time. Where it's easy to get confused on this one, if it's not your motion, you have the right to speak three times. And so there is a difference. It's just that when you are introducing the motion, your close is your third time. And you will hear the presiding officer say, Senator, this is your third time. And so this clarifies what the rule has been. I understand that members that were here last year may look at this and be checking their memory to see if it's accurate. You still have the right to speak three times as an individual member as long as it's not your motion. But you do get the close...counts as one of those three times when you are the one making the motion. I hope that helps clarify this clarification in our rules and I appreciate your support on it. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Flood. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I wonder if Senator Louden might yield for a question. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Louden, would you yield to a question from Senator Pirsch? []

SENATOR LOUDEN: Yes. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: And, Senator Louden, how long have you served here in the legislative body? []

SENATOR LOUDEN: Well, six sessions. This will be my seventh. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. And so in terms of the number of senators who have served, quite frankly more than I have here, the two years plus the number of days we've been here, you're among a handful of a few, is that correct? []

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR LOUDEN: Probably so. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. And so I just defer to your historical knowledge. Has this, in all accounts, been the guiding practice that has been in place in the Legislature according to the rules that have been under, have we always just had the introducer of a proposal speak, introduce, then speak twice, and then his third time been a close? []

SENATOR LOUDEN: Well, it's been my understanding, and especially when we went to some of these when you go to cloture, that the introducer introduced the bill and then he got three more times after that and then he got to close. That was my understanding is the way it was always done and I was pretty sure that's the way it always worked. Senator Flood tells me that we haven't been doing it that way, but I don't know as we went to that much cloture where someone has had to run out of speaking time, but this...as I look at the other rule, the original rules in there it doesn't say anything about that. In there, my understanding of the original rules is that you can open it, you can speak for three times, and then you get to close. That's what I am on that. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. So just for the edification...to frame the issue for those members of the Legislature here what we're talking about is your ability to speak. And you're going to be speaking this legislative session and for...this binds the Legislature for decades and decades potentially. And so you're going to feel passionate about some of your bills that you're bringing forward. They're going to be very important bills. And so the question is, this would be a bill that at least based upon...the framework is, under this it would say that you can introduce your bill, you get up and you speak, and then you can speak two more times on the bill before you get your closing. My question is, hasn't it been historical practice that you get up, you make your introduction, then you can speak three times, and then do your closing. And so we're not talking about...the difference here is not going to be huge amounts of time that are going to shut down this body. And keep in mind we're a one-house body, a Unicameral. We don't have a second house of, you know, keeping check on us. So these are the only times that you're going to be able to address formally to your colleagues and have it featured to make sure that things are listened to and debated that the matter at hand. And so it's, I think, it is not...if this is true that historical practice has been three times I think that we ought not change it. At least that's my concern. And so I wonder if we could hear any comment from other senators who have been here. Like I said, Senator Louden has been here, I believe he said six terms. My service here in the Legislature has been two sessions, and I must say that the vast majority of this body is very young. And so I would appreciate any other additional comments that...if any of the more senior members of the body had any kind of experiences or remembrances with respect to practice that they would like to give voice to, I think that we would find that particularly compelling. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: One minute. []

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR PIRSCH: But it is concerning to me that this change would limit the voice, or could limit the voice of some member of this body who does want to have an additional chance to speak. It's just an additional five minutes. And so towards that, towards that I don't think that this would in any way, shape or form bring a halt to the process. I haven't heard a reason for making, if it is a substantive change, doing it. Has there been an abuse in past years? So I'd be interested in hearing from the senior members of the body if Senator Louden's perception is not their perception, and also others who would have an objection to having three independent chances to speak before closing why that would be a bad idea. I'll yield back the balance of my time. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. (Visitors introduced.) Returning to floor discussion on proposed rule change 3 to the permanent rules, those wishing to speak, we have Senator Stuthman, Senator Louden, and Senator Sullivan. Senator Stuthman, you're recognized. []

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I've served in this Legislature for six years. This is my seventh year. I have a real problem with the direction that we're setting right at the present time. In my opinion, in the years that I've been here, the individual whose bill was up for debate had the ten minutes to open on it. Everyone in the legislative body had an opportunity, including the senator that introduced the bill, three 5 minute time frames. Now it seems like we're having 48 getting three 5 minute time frames and the one only getting two 5 minute time frames to discuss probably the most important thing, information on his bill. I think we're trying to shut the individual down for 5 minutes on his bill. But if he only gets two times to talk and he has the information to bring, he needs to bring that information in his closing because he will not have the opportunity to speak the three times that everyone else in this legislative floor has an opportunity to do. They all have three times but the one individual that has his bill up for debate and has information on that bill only gets two times. He gets slapped in the hand. If he has information to bring, they will not allow him to speak that third time. I suppose if he has his light punched and he's up next to talk, they'll say, sorry, Mr. Introducer, you can have your 5 minutes but you'll have to use that as your closing. I think we're trying to create something that's going to be a problem down the road. Why can't everyone on this legislative floor have the same opportunity in the time frame for debate? Why don't we allow this? It's been done that way in the past. You get to open, you get to talk three times, and you get to close. I don't see what the problem is. Everybody else gets three times to debate it. But the guy that introduces it, just because of the fact that he utilized his 10 minutes to open and explain his bill to the legislative body, he gets 5 minutes taken away from him. He gets spanked if they take...if he even thinks about speaking three times. I think this is a change that is not needed. I think it's going to create a real controversy because we're going to pick one individual out. And everyone of you here are going to experience it, because everyone of you is going to be having a bill that you will have a 10 minute opening on, and then

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

you only get two times to talk, but everybody else can get three. So I think this is something we need to really seriously think about. I realize the fact there's 37 of you that have two years or less experience. But are we totally going to change the direction of what has been done in the past? I don't think so. So I urge... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: One minute. []

SENATOR STUTHMAN: ...you to vote this change down. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Stuthman. (Visitors introduced.) Returning now to discussion on proposed rule change 3, those wishing to speak, we have Senator Louden, Sullivan, Flood, Wallman, Friend, Janssen, and others. Senator Louden, you're recognized. []

SENATOR LOUDEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. As I look at this rule change I question whether it is something that needs to be done. We've worked quite well for several years with the other system that we've had in place. As Senator Flood had mentioned, it wasn't working exactly like we thought it was. But as I read the rules, the introducer, and that's what it's all about, is introduce the bill. How many of you read all of the bills that come in here and read them thoroughly? So every bill that comes in needs to be introduced and that has to be a certain time frame, so consequently the introducer is the one that should get that up to 10 minutes to do that. Then as Senator Stuthman pointed out, if you're going to do the three 5 minute intervals that different senators get to speak, the introducer then is at quite a disadvantage because he's already lost 5 minutes on it. And then, of course, as you look in the old rules why then you got 10 minutes to close, which is very important. The closing shouldn't be part of your 10 minutes of discussion and debate. The closing is there for whoever introduces the bill to go over the bill and sum up what some of the pros and cons that have been discussed about it. So that's all very important. I don't see as we need to hurry this process along and this is what it looks like to me that we're doing by taking it out to where the introducer's closing would be part of his 5 minute time frame. I don't think this is a very good rule. I would urge everyone to vote against this thing. I don't think this has been well thought out. I think this is something we don't need. I think we go with what we had before, and I'm certainly going to vote against this rule change. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Louden. Senator Sullivan, you're recognized. []

SENATOR SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I would like to speak against the proposed rule change. I have, as a new senator, no historical perspective on this but my common sense tells me that the introducer of the bill is not only probably one of the most knowledgeable but also the most passionate in terms of

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

why this legislation should move forward. So I think that individual should have the opportunity to voice his or her opinion on this, and I think the proposed change limits that. So I would again emphasize that I'm going to vote against this proposed rule change. Also having a little bit of journalistic background, and I didn't know if it was appropriate to weigh in on this, but there are a couple of not necessarily typos, but in the actual way that it's written, there are a couple of items that really should be changed. Instead of the "mover, proposer" is proposed to be stricken, it should say, "the introducer" and remove the word "or." And then I think there was another one. Oh, it should be on about the sixth or seventh line down, it says "every other member." It should be "every other members choosing," so just a few typos. So with that in mind, again I emphasize that I intend to vote against this proposed rule change. Thank you. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Sullivan. Senator Flood, you're recognized. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President, and members. This rule originated from a conversation I had with the Clerk of the Legislature who said that it has been our practice to offer an introduction and then three opportunities to speak. And if you read the rule that was in existence last year, and I guess it would be in our temporary rules, there's no specific provision in there about closing. The third time was presumed to have been the closing and we would advise the member of the Legislature at that time. There is a policy decision here. Do you want to speak...do you want to have an opening, speak three times, and have a closing? Do you want to have an opening, speak twice, and then have a closing? But when Senator Stuthman said you get two bites of the apple, that's not correct. You get a 10 minute open, and then you get three 5 minute opportunities to speak, and the third opportunity is your closing. You have four bites of the apple. You have a total of 25 minutes on every given motion. That's been the way we've done things in the past. There is no change. There is no change of procedure or policy. This is doing exactly what we've done in the past. And if you heard last year the presiding officer say, senator, this is your third time, that meant it was their third time to speak in finality and there would not be another opportunity. Other ways the presiding officer says it would be, senator, this is your third time, you're recognized to close. Now if that's not how you recall it, then there's a possibility the Chair was in error, possibly, or there's a possibility that you might have not recalled it the way the rules provided, but that the third time meant it was the time to close. This isn't a hill to die on. This isn't something that I have to have but it is something that clarifies the rules. And so vote your conscience. If you think this limits your ability to speak, we'll see how the Chair rules on this. We'll leave the rule the way it is. We'll do the same thing we've done before. This simply clarifies the rules. There was never an attempt here to try and limit the ability of a legislator to speak. Senator Sullivan, I appreciate your concerns. But I will tell you, this has been the way we've done it. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Flood. Senator Friend, you're

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

recognized, followed by Senator Janssen. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Legislature. It's interesting over an interim how massively and rapidly things can change. I would never presume, ever, to speak for Senator Ernie Chambers but he would laugh at this. That this is my guess, he would laugh at this. These types of rules...first of all, I think this rule is innocuous. I don't think it affects our life in this Legislature for the 90-day session or a 60-day session at all. I'll explain that in a second. He'd laugh at this. He'd say, this is an Ernie Chambers' type of thing, he'd say, "you all can do whatever you want. You cannot stop me. I own you." (Laughter) But here's the kicker. It's flipped. He wouldn't have any use for a rule like this. He never would have needed a rule like this, but neither do we. I've sat in that President's Chair on occasion. I bet I could count on one hand the amount of times that an introducer of legislation actually used every opportunity that they could use. Not only is Speaker Flood correct, it provides clarification, it also cleans it up. And it provides clarification for a bunch of pages that are sitting up there going, "now, does the close count as three or is the...the 10 minute opening. By the way, have you ever sat through a 10 minute opening when somebody is reading it. By the third time that person speaks, if you don't have an idea about what that person is trying to do, you've got a little bit of an issue. You either haven't read the bill or you have no idea what the heck is going on out here. Somebody correct me if I'm wrong. This is innocuous. This doesn't make any difference. If you can't find time to speak out here, you have even less of a clue than you ever would have imagined. There's 48 other people that are more than willing, if you're trying to filibuster something that is really bad, to hand you time if you feel like you need the time to do it. But this, the reason it's innocuous, when was the last time you saw the introducer of a bill try to filibuster their own bill? I don't need the time. If it's a good idea, it will move forward. If it's a bad idea, there's going to be plenty of other people piling on. I guess the point that I'm making is, you introduce the bill, you've got 10 minutes. You've got two other times after that and then you've got to close. If you need those two other times and that closing, is anymore than I would ask for the advancement of this legislation, my guess is you've got some issues. So I would say this. Do what you want with this, but this is innocuous. I'm going to vote for it because I don't see that it's going to make much of a difference in our lives, and I'm serious about that. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Friend. Those wishing to speak, we have Senator Janssen, Pirsch, Lautenbaugh, Stuthman, and others. Senator Janssen, you're recognized. []

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I rise today having very little experience working under these rules and I will not speak for the entire incoming class, if you will with me. But I was...when I got to my office this morning, the many things I did this morning, met with firemen, met with the Governor for his budget briefing, and then we had rule changes in front of us. I feel a little uncomfortable

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

changing rules that I have not yet fully worked under in changing those rules. So that's where I get uncomfortable. Senator Friend had just a couple of questions. He says, have you ever sat through a 10 minute opening. No, I have never sat through a 10 minute opening. Never been here for that before. When was the last time when you sat and listened to a filibuster. Have never done that, not done that before. I get uncomfortable changing rules especially this particular session. Why not give the new members of the body a year in which to operate under these current rules, which I have read through once so far, which was beat in my head during orientation. Read the rules, know the rules. Read the rules, know the rules. And, oh, by the way, in orientation I was told you get three times to speak and to close. That's what I was told. At least that's what I took from it. We may have taken different things. So where I get uncomfortable is not just with this particular rule, even the rules we just passed, but all the rules that we're talking about changing. I feel like I'm getting ready to engage in sometimes debate with senators that obviously know the rules much better. And now, senators, they're changing some rules, and perhaps in their favor, I don't know. This certainly seems like a housecleaning measure. I just question the timing that these rules changes have come before us. Thank you. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Janssen. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I guess my concern is this, has there been just this backlog of problems that have built up and built up and built up over the years that really necessitates that we have to have this change in what has been existing language for my understanding for decades, and decades and decades and decades in such an important matter. You know, we are again, when you listen here today to those members who have more than just a couple of years service here, the ones with historical knowledge, their understanding is that there has been three opportunities in addition to the intro and the close. But...so from a historical standpoint, I think that that's very persuasive. But I guess what I'm getting at, whether you believe it actually in practice has been that way or not been that way, is that really relevant? What we're talking about here is, do we need legislation? I mean, if it ain't broke, you know, why fix it. Has there been some sort of angry debate on the floor this year, the last year, the year before that, the year before that, the year before that, that necessitates this, bringing this to a head? And if it is so vague and so interpretable in two different manners, why would we want to interpret this in a manner which is most restrictive, which takes your senatorial powers and constricts them? This is not wide destructive types of powers we're talking about, even if it was, which according to the senior members isn't. This is simply merely another 5 minutes to talk on...and keep in mind what we discuss here today, we don't have a second...we don't have a second house, and what we discuss here today affects Nebraskans, 1.7 million Nebraskans. This is matters of billions and billions of dollars that we debate in this Chamber every year and you're not willing to give another 5 minutes for that? Billions and billions of

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

dollars and matters of life and death, literally, that go on here. Now the senior members of our delegation say that this is...the only ones who have spoken here today, that this is their understanding. The new ones who have just come in said that that's their understanding as well, that that's what's based on their orientation. But I tell you, does it really matter? This is a solution in search of a problem. And so if it is the prerogative of the Chair then to limit it such, then we can always say as a body, that gives us senators the ability on a case-by-case basis, if we leave it where it is, to just vote if the problem ever does arise, which is hasn't for decades. And so if it ever does arise, it's not like we'll be stymied or everything will grind to a stop. It will be a simple matter of the Chair will just say, I believe you're only given two times to speak. And then we as a body, everyone here will speak, and we are a branch of government that are coequals. We have no uber senators and so we will then be given a vote and it will happen on that register up there, and if 25, if it's a simple majority of the body says I believe that he can proceed, then that speaker will proceed. And that's the senator saying, we need more information. A majority of the senators will be saying, we want to hear more. We're not definitely decided but we want to have more information, one more time, at least another 5 minutes. And so we're not...this isn't something, if we don't impose this rule, something that will bring the government, this branch to a screeching halt. It will be a...everything will stay the same. The problems that haven't developed still won't develop but if they do, there's a simple remedy that just takes a couple of minutes. And so... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: One minute. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: ...I just ask you to keep in mind, the matters that you're elected by your constituents so that you'd represent them. And this is the best way for you to have a continuing voice and so that we're a body of equals. Remember we take on weighty issues, matters of life and death, and billions of dollars and why you would want to not have that input. And keep...matter term limits, too, if it's a matter of interpretation whether to allow more time, we...with term limits, it is a new day and age and we need that additional information with the vast influx of new incoming members. And so for all these reasons, keep it the same, don't change anything. There's no problem, hasn't been, and there won't be under this method as well. And if, theoretically, any crazy thing came up, there would be just a simple resolution would take a couple of minutes. So for that reason...on the other hand, if you go the other way and change it, you would potentially disenfranchise the voice on such weighty matters and so... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Time. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: ...for that reason I'd urge you not to vote for, to vote against proposed rule change 3. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Senator Lautenbaugh, you're

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

recognized. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Is this my second time?
(Laughter) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: It is. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: So I get two more? (Laughter) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Temporary rules, you get one more. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Okay. Thank you. I've heard someone ask the body to vote their conscience on this. There is no way on God's green earth this should rise to the level of you having to consult your conscience on this. I promise you that. I can't...I realize I sound passionate right now, but passion is completely misplaced on this rule. This does not rise to that level. Understand if this proposed rule fails, this proposed rule will be in effect because that's the way they do it up there. So if you vote this down, you're still going to live under this rule. This rule at least clarifies the rules. And if there's a question regarding the timing of this, it's my understanding this is when we always do changes to the rules and adopt the rules at the start of the session. I know I'm a new Chairman on this. I'm not asking you to help me out and vote because I'm a struggling new Chairman. This change wasn't my idea and I'm not struggling. But if you don't vote for this you're going to live under it anyway, so we might as well be clear. As I understand it, that's the whole rationale for bringing this rule. And I'm going to yield the rest of my time and sit down dispassionately because I don't want you to consult your conscience. I just want us to vote yea or nay and move on. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. Those still wishing to speak, we have Senator Stuthman, Dierks, and Gloor. Senator Stuthman, you're recognized. []

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I have been visiting with the Clerk and I never realized that your opening was considered as your first time, and then you got your second time, and your third time. But in visiting also with some past senators that have been here for many, many, many, many years, they had stated that it was your opening, three times, and then your closing. So no matter which way it goes, I think the problem that I'm having is the fact that when, if the individual introduced the bill and his second time in speaking on the bill they said, this is your third time. I don't remember that and I'm not sure. And I've never kept track of, you know, when your third time was announced, this is your third time, whether that was included in your opening remarks. But I'm having a little problem with reading the Rule 2, Section 10, and it states that "he or she first presents the matter to the Legislature." This individual that introduced the bill presents the matter to the Legislature as an

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

individual, as a senator. Then it states, "each member shall be allowed to speak three times for not more than 5 minutes on each occasion." So I'm having a little, I think we have the fact that the individual that presents the matter, he's bringing it up. He's not debating it. He's bringing the information to the floor. And then it states, "each member" which is 49, "has an opportunity to debate and discuss the bill for three times." So I kind of like to stay with what we've been doing. But I had never realized that when the individual that introduced the bill only got two times in the debate, in the discussion. I had never realized that because I think that's up to the Chair, and where they're keeping track and they must, when you introduce it, they must put that down as your first time to talk. And I had never realized that. I was under the impression that you could utilize a half an hour on each motion or bill, even if no one else talked. Ten minutes to open, three fifteens, twenty-five minutes, five minutes to close. But what has been brought to my attention is the fact that you maybe only get the two times to talk after you've introduced the motion. I'd like to stay with what we've been doing. I think...I don't want to upset the apple cart but I had never realized that the individual who introduces the bill only has an opportunity to speak two times on the bill. He can speak more times if he gets time allocated to him, which does happen occasionally. So like Senator Lautenbaugh had said, you know, no matter what we do, if we make the change, vote for the change or not, it's probably going to be what's happened before. But I just wanted to clarify that a little bit. I was under the impression the individual that introduced the bill had the same opportunity of the rest of the 48 senators. And I think the senators that I visited with that have been here 25 years, used to be with us that are not here anymore,... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: One minute. []

SENATOR STUTHMAN: ...understood the fact that you introduced the bill, spoke three times, and then you got the opportunity to close. But I will respect the Clerk on his information and that's the way it's been. But the fact that I didn't realize that the first when you opened on it, that was your first time to debate it. I think that's the time to get the information out. No one knows better on the bill than the individual that introduces the bill for his 10 minutes on the opening. So with that, thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Stuthman. Senator Dierks, you're recognized. []

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Legislature. I guess, probably, I have had more experience than anyone with that. I don't recall ever having a need to have more time to develop a bill than I had allotted to me in the past. If you need to, the easy way, of course, is put an amendment up and you get four more times to talk. Then you can withdraw the amendment. It's really not that difficult. I really hate to limit debate. I think that if there's something that needs to be talked about, why we ought to be able to do that. Sometimes it ends too quickly, but I really think that we

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

really need to...that we should give big consideration to limiting debate. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Senator Gloor, you're recognized. []

SENATOR GLOOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure how I'm going to vote yet on this. I'm still absorbing the combined wisdom of this body. But with all deference to Senator Janssen, I went back and looked at my notes which are, nerd that I am, very extensive from my orientation. And it says clearly in my notes, closing done by the introducer counts against the three times that you may speak in addition to the introduction. So that was made clear to me during my orientation. I also remember a discussion we had with a former Senator Kermit Brashear, a very learned Senator, and whose judgment I trust, who pointed out something that my business background tells me is also a common sense approach towards the thing and that is, if you have something to say, you should be able to say it clearly and distinctly one or two times. Senator Brashear's comment was, when you introduce a bill don't talk it to death and because of that I have some things to consider before I cast my vote. Thank you. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Gloor. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I believe I'm the last one speaking so we'll take this to a vote right now. And, I guess, I appreciate all the comments but what you've heard here today is at least it's a matter of interpretation as to what has been the current practice. But I think that when you look at where we're at with term limits, we've got a relatively newer set of senators here. So why not at least have the opportunity and that's what we're saying here for the Chair to interpret it as the senior senators have stated and those who have retired from the senate decades ago, as Senator Stuthman said, interpret it that there was the introduction, the three chances to speak, and the close. Again, what we're talking about here is a difference of 5 minutes that's in debate. As a practical matter if that does come up, then the Chair will give a ruling and then we as coequal senators will have the ability to, as...give a majority vote on whether we should or we shouldn't. And I think that's appropriate. And so for...insofar as that we're talking about weighty issues, we only, you know, we're not, you know, in terms of the floor, we don't have a second house, a countercheck and balance. I think everything you hear here on the floor is going to be important and it isn't going to make a substantive difference. No one is going to miss dinner because of this. But very important matters will be able then to be discussed that may change your mind on important legislation. You'll be surprised. And so for this, I would ask you to, for all of these reasons, I would ask you to vote no, keep the rule the way it has been, there's been no problems experienced thus far and again, don't anticipate any in the future. So I urge you to vote no on this and I would ask for a call of the house at the appropriate

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

time, Mr. President. I'll yield the balance of my time. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to close on the proposed rule change 3. Senator Lautenbaugh waives closing. The question for the body is, shall proposed rule change 3 be adopted to permanent rules? And there's been a request to put the house under call. The motion is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote yea; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: 37 ayes, 0 nays, to place the house under call. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: The house is under call. Senators, please return to the Chamber. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. Senators, please check in. Senators, the house is under call. Please return to the Chamber and record your presence. Senator Cornett, Senator Ashford, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. Senators Ashford and Cornett please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. Senator Pirsch has authorized us to proceed without Senator Ashford. The question before the body is, shall proposed rule change 3 be adopted to the permanent rules? All those in favor vote yea; all those opposed vote nay. Have all those voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: 30 ayes, 14 nays, on adoption of proposed change 3. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Proposed rule change 3 is adopted. With that, I raise the call. Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Lautenbaugh, Chair of the Rules Committee, would report on proposed change 4 with regards to Rule 1, Section 12. (Legislative Journal page 190.) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to open on proposed rule change 4. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. This language deals with the motion to overrule the Chair and the fact that no member may speak more than once, which has been the previous ruling of the Chair. The proposed language would place that language in the Rules. As a side note, on April 15, 2008, during the discussion of a motion to overrule the Chair during a debate of LB819, Speaker Flood ruled that members could not yield time, and that they could not ask questions of another member. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You have heard the opening on proposed rule change to 4. The floor is now open for discussion. Senator

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

Flood, you're recognized. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President, and members. This rule change follows the precedent that has been set in the past when the Chair is overruled. I'm usually the one in the Chair and it has been the practice under my rulings to not allow other members to yield. This is a practice that originated far beyond this time in the Legislature. It's a policy decision for the Legislature. Basically, when you are overruling the Chair, the Chair will make a ruling, for instance, whether or not an amendment is germane or the Chair will make a ruling as to whether or not a member's question to the Chair is yes or no. It depends on what the question is. But let's take for instance a situation where there's a bill on subject X and somebody introduces an amendment on subject Y. It is up to the Chair at that point to decide whether or not subject Y is germane. We looked at a number of things. Is it in the same chapter of law. Is it rationally related to subject X, and then the Chair will say either it's germane or it's not germane. And if you're not satisfied as a member of the Legislature with the ruling of the Chair, whether it's the Lieutenant Governor, senator Langemeier, or myself, or whoever is in the Chair at that time, you have the right to challenge the ruling. And the way we've done it in this Legislature in years past is that each person, each member gets to speak once. I can't, if I'm challenging the Chair, I can't give my time to Senator Lathrop. I get to speak. I don't get to ask other members questions. You get to state your objection to the Chair's ruling and then after everybody has had a chance to talk, if that's what they want to do, we vote. And it takes 25 votes to overrule the Chair. That's what this is about. This is a technical change. It's a policy decision. I think it's been very effective the way we've used it in the past. I have had several challenges to my rulings. I would say I'm fifty-fifty in terms of how they come down, and that's the way it should be. It's up to the Legislature at the end of the day. But this is just the process for challenging the Chair. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Flood. Those continuing the discussion, those wishing to speak, we have Senator Pirsch and Senator Stuthman. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I appreciate the comments of the Speaker here today. Again, you know, I have a...11 proposed rule changes I have questions or concerns with respect to 2 of these 11. And so with respect to this, the Speaker has indicated that this has been, though not enshrined within statute, a historical practice of the Legislature and has not been a problem. My intention here today is not to slow down the process or lead to unnecessary argument but what we do here today with respect to these rules is very important because these will bind you this year and for years into the future. And so given that this has been, and I'd be interested if anyone has any comments that this hasn't been a historical precedent, but insofar as this, you know, the Speaker has said that this has been, I don't have any particular objection to this proposed rule. I'll yield back the balance of my time. []

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Senator Stuthman, you're recognized. []

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I think this is a very good rule change. The only thing that brought to my attention when I was reading it over and then Speaker Flood stated it took 25 votes for this one to overrule the Chair. Yes, that is true if everyone is here. And we've seen this in the past where sometimes you think, well it gets 24 votes or it needs 25, but we think well maybe it didn't pass then. But the fact is, according to what has been a custom is a majority of those present shall be required to overrule the Chair. So there could be only 30 people here and 16 could overrule the Chair. So I think we need to keep that in mind. I mean, this is one where it doesn't take 25 votes. It just takes the majority of the people present. But if there is, you know, a call of house and everyone is here, then it does take 25 votes because that's the majority. But if there is a call of the house and there's only 40 here, then it does take 21. So I just wanted to clarify that because there's been times in the past several years when I thought, oh, my gosh, it didn't make the 25 votes. Well, it didn't need 25, it just needed a majority. So I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Stuthman. Seeing no other lights on, Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to close. Senator Lautenbaugh waives closing. The question before the body is, shall proposed rule change 4 be adopted to our rules? All those in favor vote yea; all those opposed vote nay. Have all those voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: 36 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of proposed change 4. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Proposed rule change 4 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, next item. []

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Lautenbaugh, Chair of Rules, would offer a change to Rule 6, Section 14. (Legislative Journal page 190.) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you. Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to open on proposed rule change 6. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. This section deals with the Appropriations bills and the procedures of the body after a veto is received from the Governor. The Chair has ruled both ways in terms of whether the Appropriations Committee recommendation could be divided. This change says the Appropriations Committee recommendation shall not be divided. The proposed language would clarify that and opt for one practice of the past rather than the other. The thinking behind this was that it would just give the Appropriations Committee the

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

first bite at the apple as far as the override goes, so to speak, and give deference to their recommendation. After that, any member would still be free to move to override any specific vetoed provision. So that was the thinking behind this, and I would request your approval of this. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You have heard the opening on proposed rule change number 5. The floor is now open for discussion. Senator Lathrop, you're recognized. []

SENATOR LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President, and colleagues. I would like to...I am opposed to this rule change and I'd like to make a little preamble to my remarks. First is, is that I have served on and did serve on the Rules Committee, and I'm the lone dissenter on this proposed change. I would also like, before I tell you exactly why I oppose this, to recognize the work of the Appropriations Committee. This...my remarks and my opposition have nothing to do with the Appropriations Committee as such. They work hard. You'll find, those of you that are new, that these people that serve on Appropriations Committee work late into the night and we, as a body, appreciate their work. The appropriation process goes something like this. The Appropriations Committee meets, they talk to folks and they hear testimony about the need for various appropriations and they develop our budget. That budget then comes to the floor where the Legislature, all of us, have an opportunity to file amendments, and then to the Governor who can sign it or line-item veto various provisions. This rule change relates to that process in this way. After the Governor has line-item vetoed out what he chooses to, he or she chooses to, it then comes back to the Legislature and we are then provided an opportunity to overrule the line-item vetoes, to override them, rather. What this rule would do would be to provide the Appropriations Committee the first opportunity to put together a package of line-items to be overruled. And you may say, well, that's fine, why don't we send it over to Appropriations and let them do that work. They're the ones that know the budget. The difficulty with that is, is after they do that there may not be anything around for you. You may have a bill that needs a little bit of money and they have just put a package together that we can no longer divide, which would then be subject to a vote. And that money, those overrides then go into effect in a group and there may very well not be money left for some item that you want an appropriations for, or something in the line-item vetoes that you feel strongly about. If we do not adopt this rule, then we will find ourselves in a position where all of us...it will by then be all of our budget, not just the Appropriations Committee. I think it's more appropriate for all of us to have a say in what that package looks like rather than simply the Appropriations Committee. And for those of us who are not on the Appropriations Committee, I think this rule diminishes your ability to have a say in which of the vetoes are overridden and which of them are not. The chances that something you feel strongly about will be included in the overrides is better without this rule in my judgment, (laugh) and I believe that's a proper characterization of the rule change. And with that, I would encourage you to oppose it. Thank you. []

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise again in opposition to a rule, this proposed rule change rather, 5, really for the reason that were laid out by Senator Lathrop just now. And I tell you, it's, you know, right now the Appropriations Committee is governed by, or is chaired by Senator Heidemann. I've got to tell you, I just really appreciate the job that he's doing. I think he has done a fantastic job and really one that will, I think, is far less appreciated than it ought to be. I think he will, in the past couple of years here I've been on the Legislature, I think it has truly been a remarkable feat that he's done. And I got to tell you, from his fiscal conservative standpoint, I agree. I'm very simpatico with Senator Heidemann. But the rules that we're setting forward here today apply not just today, but tomorrow, next year, and for decades, perhaps, to come. And they bind not just me, but future legislators who have yet to be elected. And so though I am 100 percent in accord with the job our current Appropriations Chair and Appropriations Committee, all together has done just a wonderful job I believe, I think that we need to have a rule that is in itself fair and I think to a certain extent this does usurp the power, the prerogative of those of us who were elected here to do a job and it makes their decisions not subject to review or changing by those of us who were elected to do so. And so, I think, for those reasons I will urge you to vote no on proposed rule change 5. Thank you. I'll cede back the balance. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Senator Flood, you're recognized. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Mr. President, thank you. I'd like to give my time to Senator Lautenbaugh. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, 4.55. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker. After consulting with the Rules Committee, it is the desire of the Rules Committee that this proposed rule be withdrawn, this proposed amendment. And so we would request that it be withdrawn. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. Seeing no objection, proposed rule change 5 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, next item. []

CLERK: Mr. President, proposed change 6 involves an amendment to Rule 1, Section 19. (Legislative Journal page 190.) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Mr. Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to open on proposed

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

rule change 6. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. This rule deals with communications received from local government, city councils in other states. The proposed language would narrow the scope to only communications received from other states. This simply recognizes the volume of the communications received and tries to address that by limiting the number of communications to which the rule would apply, and I would urge your approval. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You've heard the opening on proposed rule change 6. The floor is now open for discussion. We had a number of lights on before, on the last amendment. Senator White, you're recognized. Not seeing Senator White on the floor, we'll move on. Seeing no other lights on, Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to close. Senator Lautenbaugh waives closing. The question before the body is, shall proposed rule change 6 be adopted to our permanent rules? All those in favor vote yea; all those opposed vote nay. Have all those voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: 35 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of proposed change 6. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Proposed amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: Mr. President, proposed change 7 involves a proposed change to Rule 6, Section 3. (Legislative Journal page 190.) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to open on proposed rule change 7. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. This rule deals with the reading of a bill on General File, section by section. The proposed change would delete that language from the rules, and I urge your approval. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You have heard the opening on proposed rule change 7. The floor is now open for discussion. Senator White, you're recognized. []

SENATOR WHITE: I am concerned that we will be deprived of hearing the dulcet tones of Mr. O'Donnell, and would urge you to reconsider because, after all, we hardly hear enough of him over the course of a session. I yield the rest of my time. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator White. Senator Loudon, you're recognized. []

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR LOUDEN: Yes, I wonder if Senator Lautenbaugh would yield for a question, if he would please. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, would you yield to a question from Senator Louden? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Yes, I will. []

SENATOR LOUDEN: Senator Lautenbaugh, you took out the part that a bill will now be read section by section unless requested by a member of the Legislature. Well, does that mean now that when we introduce a bill on General File that they will be read all the way through? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Actually, I will defer to the Speaker on this one for his rationale for this. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Flood would you yield to a question from Senator Louden? []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Yes, I will. []

SENATOR LOUDEN: Again, with this language stricken, then does that mean on General File we will have these bills read section by section, or what's the thinking about striking that language where it said a bill will not be read section by section unless requested by a member of the Legislature. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Senator Louden, this relates to a procedural move that Senator Chambers used on a bill introduced by Senator Johnson, I believe it was two years ago, where any member of the Legislature can require the Clerk to read on General File each section of the bill and then we'd vote on each section as you went along. And this removes that procedural floor ability of a member to force the Clerk to do that. I'm sure that was a great rule before computers and before all the copies we had printed out when the technology wasn't there to have every section read aloud. But in the case it was used, it was a 1,500 page bill and it would have taken the Clerk several hours. Now it was used the last time as a filibuster procedure. There's a lot of ways to filibuster in this body without making the Clerk read it section by section. So this removes that language from the Rules and I think this is very important that we pass this. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LOUDEN: I guess then...I'm wondering when you strike that then and they just read the title in the bill then, is there much difference then I guess on Select File where there won't be that much debate. But I...when a member did request that, wasn't that usually put up to a vote whether or not we would read section by section? Didn't

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

that get brought up to a vote? []

SPEAKER FLOOD: No, it was not voted on, Senator Louden. It was just a request that any member could make. []

SENATOR LOUDEN: Okay. Thank you, Senator Flood. It was my understanding that before when any member requested the bill to be read in its entirety, it was usually brought up to a vote, but perhaps I'm wrong on that. If this is what the Rule Committee has come up with, I'll probably go along with it. But I always thought before we had to bring it up to a vote if we was going to have the whole thing read all over again. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Louden. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I'd just like to state for the reason I think Senator Flood set forth, and in light of the experience that we did have an actual, what may be deemed by some, an abuse of the procedure a couple of years ago, I don't think this is an unreasonable change to the rules. And so I don't have any opposition to proposed rule change 7 today. And I think in light of the fact that we do have today, as opposed to the time in which this rule went into effect, greater access to legislation through electronic means, I think that it's adequate to guard against the reason...I guess it's an adequate excuse for taking out the language that currently exists in rule 6, rather Section 3, and for that reason I will be voting for proposed rule change 7. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Seeing no other lights on, Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to close. Senator Lautenbaugh waives closing. The question before the body is, shall proposed rule change 7 be adopted to the permanent rules? All those in favor vote yea; all those opposed vote nay. Have all those voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: 32 ayes, 6 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of proposed change number 7. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Rule change 7 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, for the next. []

CLERK: The next change, Mr. President, involves an amendment to Rule 6, Section 4. (Legislative Journal page 190.) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to open on proposed rule change 7, 8, number 8. []

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: (Laugh) Thank you, Mr. President. This rule deals with the motion to return to General File from Enrollment and Review. The proposed change would eliminate this language from the rules. Again, I think this is thought of as a streamlining of a process that really served no purpose, and I would urge your approval. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. The floor is now open for discussion. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I just wanted to say in looking at the rule I don't believe I have any objection to the striking of certain, the last sentence of the current rule. So I will be voting yes for the rule change on this proposed rule change 8. I yield back the balance of my time. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Seeing no other lights on, Senator Lautenbaugh, you're recognized to close. Senator Lautenbaugh waives closing. The question before the body is, shall proposed rule change 8 be adopted to the permanent rules? All those in favor vote yea; all those opposed vote nay. Have all those voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: 40 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of proposed change 8. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Rule change 8 is adopted. Mr. Clerk. []

CLERK: Mr. President, the next change, 9 proposes amendments to Rule 3, Section 4. (Legislative Journal page 191.) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, you are recognized to open on proposed rule change 9. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. This rule deals with select committees and several proposed changes. The first change deals with the Reference Committee. It addresses a situation which occurred during the 2008 Session in which the Business and Labor Committee recommended the Legislature reject an appointment to the Commission of Industrial Relations. The proposed change would provide the Legislature with the ability to deal with an appointment that has been rejected by a committee and ultimately by the body. The second change deals with the Reference Committee as well. It addresses appointment letters received by the Clerk of the Legislature at the end of the session. Currently, letters received during the last eight calendar days of a session are not acted on. The proposed change would increase the number of calendar days. This would provide the standing committees with more time to conduct confirmation hearings on the appointments and prepare a report on the appointment for consideration by the

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

Legislature. The third and final change deals with the Redistricting Committee. The proposed change would create a new subsection of the Redistricting Committee and would renumber the remaining sections accordingly. I would urge your approval. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You have heard the opening on the proposed rule change 9. The floor is now open for discussion. Those wishing to speak, we have Senator Sullivan, Price (sic), and Friend. Senator Sullivan, you are recognized. []

SENATOR SULLIVAN: Mr. President, and excuse me. I didn't realize I pressed my button. (Laugh) []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Sullivan. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I wonder if Senator Lautenbaugh would yield to a quick question. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, would you yield to a question from Senator Pirsch? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Yes. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. You said there's three basic changes that this rule...that this proposed rule change 9 makes, and the third one would affect...could you just give a one-liner again, a brief explanation of what the third change would do. You had indicated the second one last...would change from eight to ten days the time for confirm, and then you mentioned the third. []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I may end up deferring to the Speaker on this, but it appears to just be a redesignation of the sections. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Flood, would you yield to a question from Senator Pirsch? []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Senator Pirsch,... []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Yeah. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: ...what was your question again? []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Senator Flood. And my question originally to Senator Lautenbaugh was he had mentioned it makes three changes; talked about the first two

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

changes, the second being that it would change from ten days to eight days, essentially, the time that...ten calendar days in which the appointment letter received by the Clerk of the Legislature can be acted upon; and then had indicated that there was a third change as well. And so I was just questioning just briefly, a one-liner, what is that third change again? []

SPEAKER FLOOD: I think I understand your question. My next call will be to the Capitol Commission to cease the (laugh) jackhammer that is now pounding the roof of the State Capitol while we're in session. So, Mr. Ripley, you'll be receiving a phone call so that we can do our business and hear each other speak. But, Senator Pirsch, the answer here is the third and final change deals with the Redistricting Committee. The proposed change would create a new subsection for the Redistricting Committee and would renumber the remaining sections accordingly. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: So nothing substantive at all. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Nothing substantive. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. Very good. I would just...I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I would just say that, in light of the changes, I don't have any objection, just be interested in hearing if there is any other...I don't have any objections at this time. Be interested if there is any others on the floor. I'd be certainly willing to listen, but I don't seem to have any objection to this rule change. I'll yield back the balance. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Senator Friend, you're recognized. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I think sometimes the key to trying to go through things like this, and this is just my opinion, is to...is to strike when the timing is right. Eleven thirty-five, everybody is getting hungry. Maybe the timing is right, maybe not; depends on your perspective. If you're me and you don't like a...or you think you don't like a particular rule, this might not be very good timing because people tend to vote yes and say, well, I want to get out of here, let's just move on. I am wondering if, all that said, I'm wondering if Senator Lautenbaugh would actually yield to a question for me, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Lautenbaugh, would you yield? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Yes, I will. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. Senator Lautenbaugh, do you recall during the discussion about this particular rules change, pretty simple, do you recall why? Why would a rule like this or why would a

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

change like this show up? And I just remember sitting in front of the Rules Committee--I have one later one--and I just kind of sat down and said, well, here's why I think. I mean, who brought the rules change and for what purpose, if you recall? []

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I believe this was another one introduced by Speaker Flood and the rationale was that it addressed some ambiguities that existed in the current rules that came to light during the confirmation vote, if you will, last year. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Okay, good. Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. Mr. President, I was wondering if Speaker Flood would yield to a question for me. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Flood, would you yield to a question from Senator Friend? []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Yes. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Flood. Senator, do you...last year, I don't think it's any big secret, last year there were some confirmation, you know, ideas or at least one we had some difficulty with or we had some concern about. I mean is it fair to say that not only is this clarification language but it's stuff that you...but this language is stuff that you discovered based on something that has really never occurred before until last year? []

SPEAKER FLOOD: Well, it might have occurred before but our rules last year were ill-equipped to handle a situation where the committee, Business and Labor, was very much in the majority, decided...they decided to send out a confirmation, a gubernatorial appointment, with a no recommendation of confirmation, which was a different situation than we see probably in 98 percent of the situations, and they were kind of put in a bad spot. It was almost like they could put it out but they still had to get 25 votes to confirm and it was...then we had the discussion about a double negative. At the end of the day, their recommendation was not to approve the confirmation of the appointment of this individual, and then the Governor subsequently withdrew it. So it never went to the floor, but we were heading for a fight. And Senators Lathrop and White will tell you, we wrestled with a lot of different ways to handle this, and this is a reaction to that. This does two things, I really think, or three, if you look at it. If a committee says, yes, this appointment has our approval--25 votes. It also respects the committee when they say, no, this individual does not have our approval; you've got...you know, we say no, and if they get 25 votes it's no. And then in a no recommendation it takes 25 votes. I would also add that if we fail to act on confirmation,... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: One minute. []

SPEAKER FLOOD: ...let's say a committee sends it out and they say, we don't want it, if

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

I don't get it on the floor and get it scheduled and we adjourn sine die, that individual that's been appointed essentially becomes confirmed notwithstanding the action of the Legislature. So it's important that we have a process that works quickly so that I can get the recommendation, I can get it scheduled, and we can decide one way or the other. Because when we don't decide and the Legislature doesn't weigh in, we've waived our chance to confirm, the person is appointed, and there's nothing more that can be said about it. So this is...addresses that. Thank you, Senator Friend. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Senator Flood. Mr. President, how much time do I have? []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Twenty seconds. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Twenty seconds, I...what can I say in twenty seconds? I've got some concerns about this language and I'll have my...I have my light on again. Look, I'm not trying to draw this process out. I'll explain in the next five minutes. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Friend. Senator Rogert, you're recognized. []

SENATOR ROBERT: Thank you, Mr. President. I worked on this one a little bit with Senator Lautenbaugh, Senator Flood, and Senator Lathrop to try to get this language right, and I'll address maybe Senator Friend's concerns a little bit. I think that the reason we put this rule change in here was to clarify some questions on what to do in the event (sic) of disapproval of an appointment from the Governor. And what we don't want to do is show that we are a rubber stamp and we want to make sure that we look at everything correctly, we get it to the body in a question that is understandable by everybody in what matter they vote upon the report from the committee. And there are several situations that can come from an appointment hearing concerning the report coming from the committee. You can have an approval of the appointment, you can have a rejection of the appointment, and you can have a tie. And the question that usually comes to the body, shall we adopt the report from the committee on the appointment, we got to the point last year whether...the report was to reject and the question to adopt the report or question was maybe to reject the appointment, so we wanted to try and clarify that a little bit. If this language does that, we think it does, then the question comes out just as it's stated in the rule change here. What could happen, not saying that Speaker Flood would ever do this, but a report to reject the appointment could come out of a committee. The Speaker chooses not to schedule the hearing on the floor or somebody stands up, moves for sine die, and we adjourn. The hearing report...the hearing on the floor was never done on the report, so we wanted to make sure that it gets scheduled immediately upon coming out of committee, and I think we've covered that all in this language. And we looked over it several times and revised it

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

several times, and I think that's where we're at. But we'll be...anybody on the committee would be happy to answer any questions on that. Mr. President, I'll give the rest of my time to Senator Friend. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Friend, 2 minutes, 30 seconds. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Rogert. That does help, the discussion that was occurring during the Rules Committee discussion and in Executive Session. Let me just try to articulate some of the concern that I have right now. Currently, currently, the language reads in subsection (iv), the second paragraph: "The committee shall prepare a report either approving or rejecting the appointment. Said report shall be filed with the Clerk of the Legislature. The Legislature shall then have the opportunity to accept or reject the report of the committee." I think that there's some reason the language is written that way and it's statutory in nature. Not this, this isn't statutory in nature, but it's statutory in nature that we have a situation like this with our language. This isn't arbitrary. Let me explain. Foster Care Review Board, for example, Game and Parks Commission, Commission on Industrial Relations, Racing Commission, Public Employees Retirement Board, Ethanol Board, they must be named and qualified and go through the confirmation process, according to statute. The statutes are silent on these appointments: State College Board, State Fair Board, Liquor Control Commission, Arts Council, others. Statute allows serving prior to confirmation:... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: One minute. []

SENATOR FRIEND: ...Accountability and Disclosure, that's pretty important; Environmental Quality Council; Environmental Trust; Board of Health; Highway Commission; Investment Council; Parole Board; TERC. You can be a member of TERC, according to statute, without being confirmed for X amount of time, until we come back into session and decide whether or not that gubernatorial appointment was efficient or not. Here's the...I don't even know how much time I have. Mr. President, how much is it? []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thirty seconds, and your light is next. []

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you. Here's where this is problematic. You go down later into the language that we actually are changing here with this rules change or this proposed rules change. In subsection (v), excuse me, or subsection five, in any appointment letter received by the Clerk of the Legislature during the last, "eight" is stricken and we're changing it to "ten"... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Time. You're on your...you're recognized on your time. []

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. President. We've changed it to ten calendar days of any regular session, it shall not be acted upon. Acknowledge...let me reread that: Any appointment letter received by the Clerk of the Legislature during the last ten calendar days of any regular legislative session shall not be acted upon." That is conflicting with the new language in subsection (iv): "If the Legislature fails to adopt a report to approve an appointment by a majority vote of the elected members, the appointment is thereby rejected. If the Legislature fails to act the appointment is thereby rejected." Again, "If the Legislature fails to act the appointment is thereby rejected." This is confusing language, folks. What we have done, there are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 17 lines of new language where we had before...you ever heard the old adage--and I heard it for the first time in my life about four years ago on Judiciary Committee when I brought a bill--tough cases make bad law? If this is a...if this has come to fruition because of a situation that occurred last year, if, in the Business and Labor Committee, and the Business and Labor, I understand--Senator Cornett's committee rejects a particular...a gubernatorial appointment and we had a chance to...we were going to get a chance to vote on that gubernatorial appointment--I understand the consternation. What I'm a little concerned about is does this fix that problem or is this adding something? I hate the term "unintended consequences," so I'll say is this adding something that we just don't want to happen or we don't know what will happen if we actually include this language in here? Look, I can sum this up really quickly. My guess would be that if we can get rid of the language, if we can get rid of the language in subsection (iv), and I may...I may ask for that, I may throw up an amendment, if the Legislature fails to act the appointment is thereby rejected. I don't think we need that language. I think that's as simple as I can put it. I don't think we need any of this language, but I guess I'm willing to move forward if we can get rid of that language, unless somebody can give me a really good reason why we're conflicting with language that's two paragraphs later. I haven't heard it yet. I mean this is...I wouldn't say it's torturous language, but I was reading it this weekend and last, and again this morning, and I couldn't exactly figure out what we're trying to accomplish. And my guess right now tells me if we can get rid of that, I would have a little less consternation. Look, you guys make the call. I'm just telling you I don't think I can vote for this rule in its current form. Thank you, Mr. President. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Friend. Senator Pirsch, you're recognized. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I appreciate Senator Friend's question with respect to this proposed rule. I just want to, if he would yield to a quick question, to clarify, I guess, his criticism. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Senator Friend, would you yield to a question from Senator Pirsch? []

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR FRIEND: Yes. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Senator Friend. There's no line numbers to help reference the two paragraphs that you indicated were in seemingly opposition to each other, but if I'm correct, you're talking with regard to proposed rule change 9, the bottom of the second page of that rule change, the last full complete paragraph which starts: "If the Legislature fails to adopt a report to approve an appointment by a majority vote of the elected members, the appointment is thereby rejected. If the Legislature fails to act the appointment is thereby rejected." Is that the first of the two paragraphs? []

SENATOR FRIEND: That's correct. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. And the second paragraph, which you are concerned about that paragraph being in opposition to, is on the following page, the second full paragraph down which begins: "In the event that the committee files a report making no recommendation on the appointment, the report shall be considered by the Legislature within five legislative days," and thereon. Is that correct? []

SENATOR FRIEND: Well, and, Senator Pirsch, in order to save time, I have concerns about that language, too; I just didn't raise them. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. []

SENATOR FRIEND: My concern is how it affects existing language. They changed language...the Rules Committee changed language from "eight" to "ten" in the paragraph right after that. Then it more or less says that...well, let's read it with the change: "Any appointment letter received by the Clerk of the Legislature during the last ten calendar days of any regular legislative session shall not be acted upon." In my reading, it conflicts with new language that we're putting in up in the previous paragraph that you read into the record. Now... []

SENATOR PIRSCH: And...and...I'm sorry, where is the "eight"...the amendment with respect to the "ten" to the "eight" days again? Oh, there we are. That's the third...third... []

SENATOR FRIEND: Subsection (v) or V. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Subsection (v). So that's the paragraph that you are, you know, with respect to any concern about being opposed to each other, the first paragraph I read to you, that's the second paragraph that you believe is in opposition to the...? []

SENATOR FRIEND: I think it could be problematic. I don't know that it's in opposition. I want to...what...it could be problematic because we are...we are statutorily obligated

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

under certain circumstances to inject gubernatorial appointments onto these commissions and committees, okay? It could be problematic, this language could be problematic because let's just say under certain circumstances that the Legislature doesn't act. In the language previous we're saying that this gubernatorial appointment is null and void, it's not going to happen,... []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Right. []

SENATOR FRIEND: ...while that person has been serving on that committee for nine months. Under the silent on the appointment qualified category, there are all kinds of appointments or commissions that somebody could serve on and be kicked off of when who deems it appropriate. I don't really know. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Is it your concern that the full last paragraph on the...that we...in the first paragraph, "if the Legislature fails to adopt a report to approve an appointment," that this change would say the appointment is thereby rejected, whereas in subsection (v) it says any appointment letter received by the Clerk of the Legislature during the last ten calendar days of the regular session shall not be acted upon? Is that...do you read those in opposition? []

SENATOR FRIEND: Yeah, and I have concern about that, but let me make sure that I separate the philosophical concern from the practical concern, okay? []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: One minute. []

SENATOR FRIEND: I don't have a...and, sorry, Senator Pirsch, I'm on your time, but my philosophical concern is not that great. I mean if a committee...if a committee decides that they don't want a particular person appointed, maybe that committee should be able to block that appointment. I don't really...I'm not going to get into that piece of it yet. What I'm saying is it shouldn't be done without any action being taken at all. And these two pieces of language just cause me a little bit of, you know, concern because I don't even...I don't really know how that's going to be practically applied based on how we have statutory authority, or the Governor, I should say, has statutory authority to actually appointment people or to get people involved in committees or, excuse me, commissions. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Very good. I appreciate your comments. I tell you, I think it's very important that people speak up and at least share their concerns on this day. I don't think that it means you're... []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Time. []

SENATOR PIRSCH: Right. Thank you very much, Mr. President. []

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 20, 2009

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Mr. Clerk, new bills. []

CLERK: Mr. President, I do have new bills. (Read LB422-499 by title for the first time.) Mr. President, in addition, I have hearing notices from the Appropriations Committee, the Urban Affairs Committee, the Revenue Committee, signed by the respective chairpersons. New resolutions: Senator Heidemann offers LR8, Senator Fulton offers LR9. I have two communications from the Speaker with respect to referring LR7 and LR9 to the Reference Committee for purposes of conducting a public hearing. One new...one last bill. (Read LB500 by title for the first time.) A series of name adds: Senator Nordquist to LB92; Senator Cornett, LB160, LB162; Senator Carlson, withdraw from LB162; Senator Rogert to add, LB254; Senator Nordquist, LB262; Senator Janssen, LB285; Senator Stuthman, Campbell to LB346; Senator Rogert, LB374; Senator Rogert, LB375; Senator Mello, LB381. (Legislative Journal pages 203-218.) [LB422 LB423 LB424 LB425 LB426 LB427 LB428 LB429 LB430 LB431 LB432 LB433 LB434 LB435 LB436 LB437 LB438 LB439 LB440 LB441 LB442 LB443 LB444 LB445 LB446 LB447 LB448 LB449 LB450 LB451 LB452 LB453 LB454 LB455 LB456 LB457 LB458 LB459 LB460 LB461 LB462 LB463 LB464 LB465 LB466 LB467 LB468 LB469 LB470 LB471 LB472 LB473 LB474 LB475 LB476 LB477 LB478 LB479 LB480 LB481 LB482 LB483 LB484 LB485 LB486 LB487 LB488 LB489 LB490 LB491 LB492 LB493 LB494 LB495 LB496 LB497 LB498 LB499 LR8 LR9 LR7 LB500 LB92 LB160 LB162 LB254 LB262 LB285 LB346 LB374 LB375 LB381]

Priority motion, Mr. President: Senator Flood would move to adjourn until Wednesday morning, January 21, at 10:00 a.m. []

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: You have heard the motion to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. The motion is carried. We are adjourned. []